



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### **Usage guidelines**

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### **About Google Book Search**

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

**B** 1,285,892













MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

30





BOOKS BY  
**PHILIP GIBBS**

**MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD  
NOW IT CAN BE TOLD  
PEOPLE OF DESTINY**

---

**HARPER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK**  
**ESTABLISHED 1817**



# More That Must Be Told

By  
HAMILTON  
Philip Gibbs  
Author of  
"PEOPLE OF DESTINY" "NOW IT CAN BE TOLD" ETC.



HARPER & BROTHERS PUBLISHERS  
NEW YORK AND LONDON



Wain  
7721  
Pol. Sci.  
9-20-1922  
gen.  
=

**MOSS THAT MUST BE TOLD**

Copyright, 1921, by Harper & Brothers  
Printed in the United States of America  
M-V



## CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	LEADERS OF THE OLD TRADITION . . . . .	I
II.	IDEALS OF THE HUMANISTS . . . . .	50
III.	THE NEED OF THE SPIRIT . . . . .	83
IV.	THE NEW GERMANY . . . . .	127
V.	THE PRICE OF VICTORY IN FRANCE . . . . .	175
VI.	THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN ENGLISH LIFE . . . . .	213
VII.	THE WARNING OF AUSTRIA . . . . .	244
VIII.	THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND . . . . .	260
IX.	THE UNITED STATES AND WORLD PEACE . . . . .	339
X.	THE CHANCE OF YOUTH . . . . .	370

Page 100 M 140. 5 11 36

407338





MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD





# MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

## I

### LEADERS OF THE OLD TRADITION

#### I

**L**OOKING back at the three years of history after the armistice—three years of blundering, moral degradation, and reaction to the lowest traditions of national politics—the most tolerant of minds examining into the causes of that evil time must formulate a grave indictment against one company of men. Arraigned before an honest jury of public opinion, they are a fairly small gang of notorious persons, politically of doubtful character and shady antecedents. They are the Leaders of Europe—the Old Gang, still for the most part in command of the machinery of government.

These men in England, France, and Italy are those who were playing the game of politics before the war, fighting for place and power, taking their turn, now in, now out, according to the revolutions of the party wheels, but, whether in or out, belonging to the inner circle of that system which under the fair name of “representative government” arranges the fate of peoples without their knowledge or consent, and by artful appeals to popular passion and ignorance, by spell words and watchwords of fine sound and empty meaning, keeps the mob obedient to their directing wills, even





## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

though they are led to the shambles with the enticing cry of, "Dilly, dilly, come and be killed."

It would be ridiculous now to re-examine all the psychological and political causes of the European war. That argument has been threshed out in millions and billions of words, in white papers and yellow papers and red papers, and in spite of the publication of secret documents from the Russian archives and the papers of other governments revealing the sinister game of bluff and bluster, intrigue and conspiracy, between the old courts of Europe, it is certain, if anything in history is certain, that nothing will ever reverse the verdict of guilty given against the German military caste for having planned, desired, and made the war. The German bureaucracy and bourgeoisie share that guilt by criminal consent, though the peasants and common folk must be acquitted on the plea of ignorance and their inability to resist the poison of false propaganda administered to them by their rulers and teachers. Let us leave it there—this terrible verdict against which there is no court of appeal except at the judgment seat of God.

But the statesmen of Europe among the nations which ranged themselves against the Germanic power cannot be acquitted of all guilt, though they pleaded a dovelike innocence when the frightful challenge of war resounded through Europe and the armies moved to the fields of massacre. They were guilty of maintaining, defending, and intensifying the old regime of international rivalry, with its political structure resting entirely on armed force and as damnably guilty of hiding from their own peoples the inevitability of the conflict which was approaching them because of this grouping and maneuvering of forces.

For many years before the war the conscience of people without power in many countries had been stirred by the spiritual idea of a closer brotherhood of



## LEADERS OF THE OLD TRADITION

man, united by the common interests of labor and liberty. In France there was a growing revolt against the burden of militarism. The spirit of "*La Revanche*," any passion of desire to recapture Alsace-Lorraine at the cost of millions of lives, had died down and almost out in the cold ashes of extinct fires. In Germany the Social Democrats, quite sincerely despite their betrayal afterward, were antimilitarists and the advocates of international peace. In England the people were so devoid of military ambition, so sure that war on the big scale had been abandoned forever by the great Powers of white civilization, that even when it happened they were incredulous, and like the countryman who saw a giraffe for the first time, said, "Nell! . . . I don't believe it!"

The statesmen of Europe—English, French, German, Russian, and others—might have allied themselves with the new idealism stirring among the common folk of Europe. Some of them, indeed, paid lip service to those ideals of international peace, and with elaborate insincerity, smiling with cynicism up their sleeves, proposed resolutions at The Hague to restrict the horrors of war and to sprinkle its stench with rose-water. But mostly, and with intellectual atheism, they used the immense and secret powers of their governments to kill the pacifist instincts of democratic idealism, to break or buy its leaders, and to secure the continuance of the old game between courts and foreign offices for commercial advantages, military alliances, unexploited territories.

These men of the Old Gang were at least no nobler than their predecessors through centuries of conflict. There was not one of them inspired by any vision of world policy higher than immediate material advantage or imperial aggrandizement. Not a man among them, seeing the shadow of a world war creeping nearer, uttered a loud cry to the conscience of humanity or any



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

warning of approaching doom or any plea for some better argument than that of massacre. They were industrious with squalid bargains for the "undeveloped" spaces of the earth in Africa and Asia. From one foreign office to another went bickering notes, claims, protests, and threats. The Fashoda crisis menaced England with war against France. The Agadir crisis, twenty years later, was a challenge to Germany by England and France—a challenge voiced by Lloyd George, the "leader of democracy," in a speech which summoned up the dreadful vision of Armageddon as lightly, as carelessly as men might tell a fantastic nightmare across the dinner table as a warning against lobster salad. It seemed so to the British people, a little startled, but not shocked into the tragic consciousness that Lloyd George's message was the revelation of enormous forces assembling and getting ready for a conflict in which the youth of Europe, ignorant of that meaning, not told in plain words, not asked for consent, would be slain by millions, because the old men of the old regime were greedy for empire, on this side or that.

It is easy to say that Germany was the wild beast of Europe, with devouring instincts, and that the other nations would have been a feebler prey, ready for the slaughterhouse, if they had been more weakened by the idealism of world peace. That is true. So is it true that in Napoleon's time France was the wild beast of the European jungle, and in other times other nations. So is it true that in England once there were seven kings at war with one another, and in Ireland sixty. So is it true that a century ago there were highwaymen in Hyde Park, and that for any slight offense or imagined insult one gentleman would challenge another and kill him, if gifted with great strength or skill or luck. The history of civilization is a gradual taming of the wild beast in human society, an education of human intelli-



## LEADERS OF THE OLD TRADITION

gence to a widening sphere of law and order and self-restraint. So it seemed, until the last war made a mockery of lawmakers and of gentlemen. The old men of Europe (not old in years, but in traditions) made never an effort to tame the wild beast in the heart of Germany (or in their own), never once raised ideals to which the German people might rise with a sense of liberty and brotherhood from the spell of Junkerdom. They made no kind of effort to get European civilization out of the jungle darkness to new clearing places of light. They were all in the jungle together. A friend of mine with bitter cynicism compared the international politicians before the war with ape-men, peering out of their caves, gibbering and beckoning to friendly apes, frothing and mouthing to hostile apes, collecting great stores of weapons for defense and offense, strengthening the approaches to the monkey rooks, listening with fear to the crashing of the Great Ape in the undergrowth of his own jungle, whispering together with a grave nodding of heads, a plotting of white hairs, while the young apes played among the trees with the ignorance and carelessness of youth.

That simile is an outrage upon the high intelligence, the fine manners, the culture and refinement of the statesmen who directed the fate of Europe before the war—men like Grey, Asquith, Delcassé, Poincaré, Viviani, Briand, Giolitti. Yet outrageous though it be, if the European system were put into the parable of the animal world, by the spirit of Æsop or of Swift or of Lafontaine, it is with jungle life and with ape life that it could only be compared.

During the war many of the statesmen of the countries engaged in that conflict behaved with the virtue that belongs to patriotism and to the old traditions of national honor. I do not underrate that virtue or those



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

traditions. In their time and when necessity demands them they call out the supreme qualities of manhood in all classes directly engaged. When once the war was declared and we were back again to the primitive contest of nation against nation, there was no other way for honorable men than devotion to the life of one's people, the highest service of one's soul for the national cause, self-sacrifice even to death. In obedience to that last law of patriotism, youth, the best of European manhood, answered the call with illimitable courage, and an immense spiritual fervor never seen on such a scale in human history. Without a murmur of revolt, uplifted by enthusiasm, at least in the early days of war, the legions of British, French, Italian, Russian, and German youth marched to the fields of death and largely died. Different motives impelled them, different professions of faith were theirs, but on both sides of the fighting lines there was the one common primitive instinct that the life and liberty of one's people could be saved only by the death of the enemy. It was a war to the death without mercy, without chivalry, except in rare cases, on either side—the worst war the world has seen.

### II

The old leaders of Europe handed over a great deal of their directive power to the military mind, which despised them with a traditional contempt for politicians, reciprocated heartily by those gentlemen who were impatient with the rigid self-conceit, the abrupt and undiplomatic manners, the complete lack of sympathy and candor among many members of the High Command. In all countries the politicians responsible for the civil organization of the state complained bitterly of the autocratic methods, the intellectual narrowness of the military command. In all countries the



## LEADERS OF THE OLD TRADITION

High Command—German, French, British—accused the politicians of “betraying” them and undermining the chances of victory.

Outwardly a political truce had been called in all countries. Party opposition had been silenced by Coalition governments in which all parties were represented. There was what the French called “L’Union Sacrée” before the enemy. Secretly, and with but a thin camouflage of decency, there were continual intrigues, conspiracies, and plots among the various groups of political personalities, aided and abetted by people of high rank and social influence. In France and England intrigues were rife in the Cabinet and the War Office. Kitchener was beset by enemies in high places and low places intent upon pulling him down by fair means or foul. The early failures of the war, the ghastly mistakes, the endless slaughter, called for victims. Every man in public life, and every woman of social influence, backed his or her fancy for the War Ministry, the Commander in Chief, the chief of staff, the army, corps, or divisional generals, and had a private personal allegiance to this man or that, or a bitter vindictive grudge against him. There were cabals for and against Kitchener and Robertson, French and Haig, Fisher and Jellicoe. Newspaper editors were invited to breakfast, luncheon, dinner, by ministers of state and generals of the High Command, in order to enlist their influence by subtle suggestions in leading articles, or personal paragraphs or open attacks, for or against the latest favorite or the latest scapegoat. Military critics, war correspondents home on leave, Parliamentary correspondents and lobby men, were favored by these dangerous attentions. The press became a hotbed of favoritism and conspiracy. The commanders in the field, Joffre as well as French, Pétain as well as Haig, endeavored to counter-attack the conspirators by forming their own

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

bodyguard of political adherents, and directing the press. Colonel Repington, military critic of the *Times*, busy as Warwick the king-maker, was invited to Sir John French's headquarters and told all the secret history of the relations between the Commander in Chief and the Secretary of War. The war correspondent of the *Daily Mail* (at that time Mr. Valentine Williams, afterward a captain in the Irish Guards) was also a "white-headed boy" at the headquarters of Sir John French. The *Daily Mail* worked up a sensation about the shortage of high-explosive shells and attacked Lord Kitchener with a ferocity which for a while so angered the British public that they burned their favorite paper in public places—and then renewed their subscriptions.

Sir John French's enemies were too strong for him after the ghastly failure of the Loos battle. Haig's friends triumphed; Robertson succeeded in supreme command when Kitchener was drowned, to the great relief of many patriots. Major-General Sir Frederic Maurice, on Sir John French's staff until his fall, was raised to a higher place as Director of Military Operations on the Imperial General Staff, under Sir William Robertson. Then another set of intrigues went on, and never finished until the ending of the war. Asquith, hounded down by the *Daily Mail* and betrayed by his own supporters, was succeeded by Lloyd George as Prime Minister of England. Then Repington, the correspondent, wonderfully confidential with Robertson, Chief of the Imperial General Staff, in close liaison with Maurice, Director of Military Operations, conducted a long-range attack upon the new Prime Minister for his conduct of the war, and revealed the most jealously guarded secrets of the Supreme War Council. Haig in France, obstinate against the idea of a unified command which would place him under the authority of a French generalissimo, conscious that Lloyd George



## LEADERS OF THE OLD TRADITION

had little faith in his generalship after the enormous slaughter of the Somme battles and the still more frightful losses in Flanders, had his attention diverted from the state of his front to the political danger behind him. With Pétain in command of the French armies, he was arranging plans which would keep Foch out of supreme command—a system of mutual defense which broke down utterly when the Germans attacked in March of 1918 and nearly won the war.

Officers home on leave, hearing some of those rumors of intrigue and private rancor, could not reconcile the spirit of it with the marvelous optimism of public men—those very people—in public print. I remember dining with Lord Burnham in London of war time. I had come home on leave from the mud of Flanders, where I had seen the tragic slaughter of our youth, the daily harvest of the wounded boys. I had no notion that it was more than a tête-à-tête with Lord Burnham at the Garrick Club, so, coming up from the country and arriving late in town, did not put on evening clothes. It was a humiliation to me (more hurtful to one's vanity than moral delinquency) when I found a company of great people, including Sir William Robertson, Lord Charles Beresford (old "Charlie B.," as he was always called), and a variety of peers and politicians who were helping in divers ways and offices to "win the war." They were the people, anyhow, who pulled many wires of our imperial activities, knew all the secrets of the war on land and sea, and held in their hands the decision of peace, if there ever could be peace, which then seemed doubtful. My ears were alert to catch any words of hope which might be a reprieve to thousands of boys—those I passed daily on the Albert-Bapaume road and other highways of abomination—who otherwise would be condemned to death. These people knew whether the Germans were weakening. To them came all the



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

reports of spies, the "peace feelers" through neutral countries, the secret views of our allies, beneath official proclamations and triumphant propaganda. God! Here I was in the company of those who held the keys of knowledge and the power of fate in this great drama of tragic history.

They talked freely. One to another they kept the conversation going without a pause. Only one man was silent, and that was Robertson. I made out that the navy was not doing well. That the sinking of our ships by German submarines was more serious than the nation knew. (Not good news, I thought, for the boys at the front!) Haig seemed to be hopeless. His battles were bloody but indecisive. It was nonsense to make out that we were winning. It was mere folly to pretend that our losses were lighter than the enemy's. The Germans still had immense reserves of man power. (So the optimism of our Chief of Intelligence did not cheer the company!) The French were troublesome again, letting us down deliberately, not working in close or loyal liaison, intriguing for supreme command. Our reserves were wearing pretty thin, in spite of the high percentage of recovery among lightly wounded men. The war might go on easily for another two years, or three, if the peoples did not break before then. . . . I listened with a sinking heart. This was gloomy and dreadful talk, more gloomy than my own forebodings in miserable hours. Here was no hope for boys I knew who would be marching to-night to the line again, sitting again in the dirty ditches under infernal fire, praying with blasphemous oaths for some miracle that would bring them a reprieve and peace.

"Well, gentlemen," said Sir William Robertson at last, "you are all very pessimistic! All I can say is if we're a bit winded, the enemy is just as puffed. It's a case of who holds on the longest."

## LEADERS OF THE OLD TRADITION

One man there had written to the *Times* that very day ridiculing the German "peace" offers and proclaiming our certainty of victory in the end. He had no certainty of faith at dinner that night, but spoke despairingly. Through all the conversation there was a note of querulous irritation against the men in high command, hardly camouflaged even against Robertson, sitting there with them, not answering their criticism of failure and loss.

It was a rainy night, and dark in Garrick Street when I went out. A soldier home on leave lurched by drunkenly and uttered a foul oath. Away in Flanders his pals would be listening to "crumps" and the whining of high velocities passing overhead and the hiss of the gas shells. The stretcher-bearers would be busy with the usual casualties—arm wounds, stomach wounds, gassed, the ordinary muck of a night's work in the line. . . . I had no hope to take out to them. Our leaders were just carrying on, hoping for the odd trick after years more of slaughter. "Just a question," said Robertson, "of who holds out the longest." That was the highest hope of our highest Generalship! . . . And Robertson was right.

Tragic history! Is it worth while washing so much dirty linen in public as that exposed to the vulgar gaze in the memoirs of Colonel Repington, Captain Peter Wright, Doctor Dillon, and many others? There is only one purpose to be served, and that was not, I think, Repington's purpose. It is to give a frightful warning to the world that the leaders who were responsible for the destiny of civilization in that time of monstrous conflict were unsafe guides, uncertain of their own way, distrustful of one another. They were but little men playing a game of hazard with millions of lives. They had, with few exceptions, no vision greater than the safety of their own jobs and the continuance



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

of their own prestige. These same men, long in power after all their failures, their intrigues, and their errors, proved themselves incapable of leading the way to new heights which we must attain unless we resign ourselves to a deeper sinking into the abyss of ruin. There was no spiritual light in them, not much of nobility, no inspiration of genius. They groped and fumbled their way to victory which came by the valor of the youth that died, and then was worthless because of what they have done with it. They put out the best that was in them, but it was not good enough—not big enough, without virtue.

### III

There never was a time in modern history when there was such a readiness for spiritual guidance among the peoples of Europe. Their guides led them into degradation. They appealed to the lowest instincts of human nature, and not to the highest. Deliberately they chose the lowest.

It began with the Peace Treaty. That document, which, for a little while, had been the promise of a new great charter for the liberties of common folk in all nations, was discovered to be nothing better than the intensification of old hatreds by new frontiers, and the aggrandizement of victorious powers by the dismemberment of defeated empires. Not deliberately, I think, but as a compromise of greedy interests in conflict, it violated in a hundred ways the principles proclaimed by President Wilson as the ideals of peace, and accepted, for a little while, by victors and vanquished. What became of the self-determination of peoples? Austria was put under Italian rule and Czech rule and Slovak rule, Germans under Poles, Turks under Greeks, Arabs under French and British. It was not a Peace for the rebuilding of civilization out of the ruins upon nobler lines, but a

## LEADERS OF THE OLD TRADITION

Peace of vengeance, and a Peace of greed, and a Peace of hypocrisy.

The old politicians who had played the game of politics before the war, gambling with the lives and souls of men for new territory, privileged markets, oil fields, native races, coaling stations, and imperial prestige, grabbed the pool which the German gamblers had lost when their last bluff was called, and quarreled over its distribution. The "mandates" obtained by Great Britain and France in Africa and Asia made the cynics chortle with laughter and the politicians of the smaller powers squirm with envy. Italy denounced them all as robbers because her share of loot was small. France was aggrieved with England because she had taken the lion's share. But the statesmen of Europe dividing the world afresh, and reconciling their spoils with the high words of justice and retribution, imagined in their ignorance of world conditions after a war of exhaustion that what they took they could hold, and that out of the ruin of their enemies they could gain great wealth. They did not understand then, nor after three years do they now understand, that not only all their own wealth was spent in four and a half years of destruction, but that all the former wealth of Europe, in all nations engaged in the conflict, had disappeared in shell fire and in blood.

Not to them was it revealed that the paper money which circulated in European countries was but a reminder of enormous debt, unredeemed and unredeemable, and a promissory note on the future industry of peoples. No single statesman of the old regime helping to draw up the Treaty of Versailles had intelligence enough to see, or honesty enough to admit, that after the scourge that had passed over Europe, killing the flower of its youth, its young tillers of the soil, its laborers, only mutual helpfulness between one nation and another, former friends and enemies, could bring



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

a chance of recovery and economic health. The complete ruin of Austria, condemned to death by the Peace Treaty, did but place a pauper population upon the books of the "Reparations Committee." It was just a hospital of starving children and a casual ward of adult unemployed, unable to buy from us or anyone, unable to work for themselves or us (because they could not buy the raw material of industry), just lapsing into decay and death, whose corruption would spread to surrounding countries.

So little did the politicians know of economic laws in modern commerce, that they did not foresee the loss to their own trades in the closing of enemy markets, nor the futility of their own industry if there were no customers to buy their products. They did not even guess that by enlarging their imperial territory, in "mandates" over races who disliked them, they were relying upon armies that could not be raised (unless we raised the dead) and wasting more millions of borrowed money in new administration, when their imperial treasury was empty except of unpaid debts, and the citizens of empire were already in revolt against the tax collectors.

Yet we must be fair to the leaders of the old tradition. Looking at the Treaty of Versailles upon the plane of thought no higher than that of the statesmen who framed it—that is, as a document carving up Europe according to the old ethics of victors dealing with vanquished and demanding retribution and reparation, it is difficult to see, except in minor details of unnecessary injustice, how a better peace could have been made. The convulsion of Europe had been so great, the conflict so widespread, that the structure of human society everywhere had been immensely upheaved and no group of politicians thinking upon the old lines of thought, each trying to make the best bargain for his own nation or empire, and to secure immediate advan-

## LEADERS OF THE OLD TRADITION

tage without much thought of the future or the commonwealth of Europe, could reconcile all conflicting interests, rearrange frontiers on reasonable lines, and safeguard the economic life of all peoples. Such an ideal arrangement was indeed impossible of achievement, owing to the geographical confusion of races and nationalities. Therefore all criticism of the Peace Treaty is futile, if it is conducted on the basis of the old philosophy of international relations in Europe with its balance of power, its rival groups, and the claim of the victor to exact the price of war from the vanquished.

The hope which for a little while leaped up in the hearts of many people was for a Treaty which would give a new call to humanity and, leading it clear away from its old jungle law, would break down the old frontiers, demobilize armed force everywhere, and unite the democracies of Europe in the common interests of labor, liberty, and peace. Whether the peoples of Europe could have risen to such an ideal at that time is uncertain. The mere thought of "letting off" Germany would have aroused fury among the Chauvinists in France, England, and the United States. It is impossible to say with any sure evidence whether the people of Europe would have been capable of rising to a height of idealism which, as we now see, would have been also good business on the most materialistic lines, as true idealism is always good business according to the old adage that honesty is the best policy, and the Christian precept, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

A mutual cancellation of our debts by a stroke of the pen in the Treaty would have been a supreme act of faith in the future of humanity which would have lighted the soul of the world. Yet in a niggling way, by the sheer impossibility of paying even the interest on those debts, or of extracting reparation out of the

would have been dethroned, so the  
claimed by us in the war would have  
a practical way it would have saved  
she will ever get from Germany and  
reconstruct more rapidly the devastated  
land still in ruins.

A spiritual appeal to the German  
people on threats of force, but calling wit  
people to another across the fields of  
peace has been answered by the offer of a whole  
the damage they had done, to atone  
by sacrifice and service, because of the  
spirit from hatred and from bondage  
new era of fellowship after the agony.  
On the plane of realism it would have  
been better, for the Allies would have gained  
more than they have gained by force, a  
peace without vengeance, burning and smoldering  
Germany now, after so many throes  
of hatred, might not have existed, but  
melted away in the enthusiasm of the  
renewal of humanity.



## LEADERS OF THE OLD TRADITION

carried on by his call to the New World. If we had had such a man, I believe firmly in my soul that this would have happened. For at that time, immediately before the armistice, and for a little while afterward, there was a mass emotion in Europe, after the long agony of the years, which would have risen to any great call. Europe was stricken, shell shocked, hysterical. And it is by the emotion of peoples that great leaders are able to fulfill their aspirations. In millions of homes families were mourning their dead, aghast at the cruelty of life, hopeless except for a vague hope of spiritual revival. The women of the world had wept until they had no more tears to weep. The fighting men, no longer filled with blood lust, if any of them ever were, for more than the minutes of killing and terror, sick of the stench of death, contemptuous of the honors and glories of their job, cynical of civilization, looking forward to some new scheme of life which would prevent this kind of thing from happening ever again, were in a mood to abandon all the old fetishes of thought which caused this conflict, and to advance to a greater victory by which the beauty and joy of life could be recaptured. But we had no leaders to take advantage of that enormous stirring of thought and feeling among the people of the stricken nations so that they might have been lifted out of the old ruts. Alas! Alas!

There seemed for a little while to be one. It was President Wilson, the only man in the world who, before the armistice, wrote words which rang true in the heart of humanity. In dirty places where men lived under the imminent menace of death they were read, as I know, with hopefulness that here at last was a leader who had a greater vision than a war of extermination or a peace of vengeance. His words were like a new Gospel, or the old Gospel recalled in this time of hatred and massacre. He looked across the frontiers of hostility, offered



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

just terms to all warring nations, promised a new world to democracy if it would disown the evil of its ruling powers. Among millions of men, to youth being sacrificed, in millions of homes, death-haunted, on both sides of No-Man's Land, his words found instant response. They raised enormous hopes. They had a spiritual, almost a divine sweetness. The Germans, below the Junker caste, the German soldiers whom I met on the battlefields, whose letters I grabbed from lousy dug-outs or picked up as they littered the shell-churned earth, put their faith in Wilson, hailed him as the great arbitrator, accepted in their souls his terms of peace. I affirm that with absolute belief. Before the armistice they raised banners in many cities of Germany proclaiming their adherence to Wilson's "Fourteen Points." After the armistice for a little while, until one by one the Fourteen Points were abandoned or betrayed, they clamored for their fulfillment.

I saw Wilson come to London. It was as though a savior of the world were passing. Miles deep the crowd stood and waited while he passed. Only the foremost ranks caught a glimpse of his silvered hairs. But from all those vast crowds came a roar of cheers in which there was a note I had never heard before, and the eyes of people about me were wet with tears. So it was in Paris when he came.

We all know now how he failed in many ways, why he failed—his hard, autocratic temper, so that even his advisers like House and Lansing were kept in ignorance of his acts and pledges, the vanity which made him weaken to flattery, the pedagogic quality of his brain, the fatal egotism which caused him to neglect the ordinary safeguards of statesmanship—consultation with his people and winning of their consent, the right and liberty of their Senate and Congress. He had the greatest chance that any man has had in the whole his-

## LEADERS OF THE OLD TRADITION

tory of the world, and he missed it. But his people missed it too, by the bitterness of their political passion, by desertion of their representative (who should have had their loyalty in this crisis of the world's fate in spite of all his errors), and by a cruelty which killed him as a leader and almost killed him as a man.

All that is old and tragic history. There is nothing new to be said about it, but its tragedy remains, and makes more difficult the task of human progress which then was easier because of that mass emotion leaping up to hope. Quickly came disillusionment, cynicism, a hark back to material and selfish interests. The lowest passions of humanity were prodded up by the press and by the politicians. The noblest souls in England in all classes were sickened and dumfounded by the moral depravity of the appeals made to the beast instinct of the mob by ministers of state and all their sycophants. In the khaki election of 1918, which gave Lloyd George a renewal of his power, there was the promise of great loot from the enemy's treasure and the Kaiser's head was to be the reward of victory. The ideals for which youth had fought in the war, at least the watchwords which had urged them to fight—the war to end war, the downfall of militarism—were flung away and forgotten. The material motive of making Germany pay for all the costs of war of all the victor nations replaced the better hope of establishing a lasting peace between the democracies of Europe.

"Germany will be squeezed," said Sir Eric Geddes, "until the pips squeak"—a naked betrayal of Wilson's pledge to German democracy which we had countersigned with our honor. *Facilis decensus Avernii*. The people who were ready for spiritual guidance yielded when appeal was made to the brute in them. They share the guilt of this degradation and are paying for it now, but the greater guilt is that of men who, seeing



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

the light, chose the darkness. The old leaders stand condemned. Theirs was the steepest downfall.

The story of President Wilson is tragic. Yet he never hauled down the banner of his idealism, and, torn and tattered though it was after his single fight with enemies in front and behind, he nailed it to the mast with his crippled hand and never surrendered in his poor, dazed soul. He was faithful to the League of Nations, though his people would have none of it. In spite of their abandonment, weakened by the immense loss of their alliance, the League of Nations still lives and struggles in a futile way against unequal odds, and is a memorial of the spirit which created it as the best hope of the world. Even now it might become the machine by which youth could re-create the world.

### v

Greater than the tragedy of Mr. Wilson was that of the other signatories of the Peace Treaty, whom, having pledged themselves to the League of Nations with the consent of their nations, mocked at it with cynical laughter, flouted its authority, undermined its purpose, and maintained the power of the Supreme Council, whose will and acts have been in direct and open conflict with the whole spirit of the League. They upheld government by force alone, whereas the League is based on government by arbitration and consent. They denied the rights of small nations to a voice in the councils of the world by declaring the will of the great victor powers enforced by standing armies. By sending representatives without authority to the assembly of the League, they deprived it of all reality in its decisions and of all influence in the settlement of world problems. They betrayed it.

Tragic was the physical breakdown of Wilson, Presi-

## LEADERS OF THE OLD TRADITION

dent of the United States. More tragic was the spiritual surrender of Lloyd George, Prime Minister of England.

It is hard for English people to speak or to write about Lloyd George without passion—passion of dislike or passion of hero worship. There have been times when most have hated him, but it is significant that the people who hated him once because of the things for which I and others liked him (his democratic audacity, his amusing vulgarity of challenge to the snob tradition of England) are now those who like him most. I hated him for his speech about the “Knock-out blow” at a time when there seemed no ending to war except by the extermination of the world’s youth. I hated him afterward for helping to arrange a peace which seemed to me to guarantee the certainty of new and more dreadful war. I hated him for handing over the fate of Ireland to men like Sir Edward Carson, Hamar Greenwood, Sir John French, General Tudor, and the gang of bureaucrats and brass hats in Dublin Castle who tried to break the spirit of a passionate people by methods of Prussian militarism, and tried to stamp out the Sinn Fein terror by a counter-terror which stoked up its fires, put murderous hatred in the heart of every Irish youth, made martyrs of those who died, and dishonored the old fame of England by an abandonment of justice, chivalry, and the spirit of liberty for which so much of English youth had died. For that I hated Lloyd George, and sometimes I think I hate him still.

Yet analyzing my own feelings I find, as so many of his political opponents find, that not hatred, but admiration strangely mingled with regret, affection twisted by anger and annoyance, amusement causing laughter with a groan in it, are my dominant impressions of this amazing little man. The straight principles of honorable men are warped under his influence. They weakened, as I have seen them, visibly, under the spell of his babe-

that has happened to trade-union critics, newspaper editors, ministers

I remember when he came out to It was the time when our G. H. Q. was by his way with them. Some of our their loathing for him openly in the thought his visit was to spy out things. The least prejudiced were convinced them from winning the war—though afterward that the war was won and process of "winning" was not visible servers. The inevitable happened. and in private laughed. After a little were treading on one another's spurs him, to listen to the words that fell of simplicity, his apparent candor, but the keenness and alertness of his mind resisted by them. They were like the presence of an inspired schoolmaster.

Many people have had the honor with Mr. Lloyd George at No. 10 (Come into my parlor, said the spider

## LEADERS OF THE OLD TRADITION

helped his guests to toast. Mrs. Lloyd George—a nice, homely woman—poured out the morning coffee. Miss Megan came down in a hurry, said, “Good morning, Dad!” and attacked her bacon and eggs with the joyous appetite of youth.

“How are things going in France?” asked Mrs. Lloyd George, with a motherly sigh for all poor boys.

“Yes!” said the Prime Minister. “Dreadful mess, that last battle, wasn’t it? Haven’t heard a word about it from G. H. Q. First I heard was when I read your articles.” Subtle flattery and pleasing to a war correspondent.

He asked straight questions, listened (unlike most great men) to the answers, uttered indiscreet criticism of high persons, chaffed Miss Megan, passed his cup for some more coffee, groaned over the horror of war with honest emotion, laughed heartily over a comic tale of the trenches, discovered a point of fact he wanted to know—the reason for the invitation to breakfast—and indulged in a bright, uncomplimentary monologue about generals, war offices and newspaper editors, until checked by Mrs. Lloyd George, who said, “Get on with your breakfast, dear.”

Going away from that meal I had a glow of personal vanity. This man, holding the fate of an empire, almost the fate of the world, in his hands, had been glad to have my views. He had listened with bright understanding eyes to my explanation of facts. He had picked up a phrase of mine and repeated it to his wife. Is it easy to resist flattery like that? . . . It is impossible.

That candor of his blue eye, that frankness of speech, that readiness to alter his own opinion in view of a new fact—were they just a camouflage of deep cunning, artfulness developed into a natural habit? I do not think so. There is in the soul of Lloyd George still a certain simplicity, a boyishness, natural and unfeigned.

of the village green. With a felt hat, his shaggy locks, an old suit amazing knees, and a gnarled stick like a courtier, he used to stroll into this house, as I have seen him do, and discuss the situation breezily with a much greater knowledge of the stark realities than those whom one might expect to know the truth—yet never with any sign of weariness.

Once with Lord Reading and a French Minister of Labor, he came to the respondents' mess in France. The meal, too, and he was exceedingly vivacious. He was that he was a keen listener to one could say. He has the gift of epigrammatic speech, and I remember a note of a descriptive phrase about the Somme which afterward he adopted. He said, "Did Shakespeare use the best he heard of?" and he was right.

One other time in the war I met him. It was a night of great honor in my life, when he gave a dinner to me and invited many others to his board. It was generous of the Prime Minister, and he was gracious and kind. He

## LEADERS OF THE OLD TRADITION

authority if he thought liberty were threatened, disapproved of a Prime Minister, once a rebel of that kind, too, who enforced authority against free speech, conscientious objection, peace propagandists, harshly in time of war. The Prime Minister held out his hand to Nevinson with a fine air of friendliness and pleasure, and only for a second, with a little extra warmth of color creeping into the ruddiness of his face, did Nevinson hesitate before he took it. The Prime Minister's laugh was heartiest when the veteran war correspondent, alluding to my greenness in my first adventure of war (out in the Balkans), said that I did not know the difference then between a staff officer and a fool.

I had to make a speech that night—an ordeal before a Prime Minister of England and such an orator as this one. Yet I kept my courage to the sticking point for the sake of youth that was being slain so wastefully, in such tragic masses. I wanted to tell Lloyd George the things that happen on a battlefield, the things happening in Flanders, every day, every night, in all the weeks and months of days and nights, so that he should think of the war not in the abstract, not as a conflict between great powers, but in its actual drama, as a shambles of boys and a world of human torture. I told him how a battlefield looked on the morning of battle with its dead, its stretcher-bearers searching for hunks of living flesh, the "walking wounded" crawling on the way back, falling, staggering up again, dropping again, the queues of wounded outside the casualty clearing stations, the blind boys, the men without faces, the "shell shocks." It was not I that was making the speech. It was the voice of the boys on the Western Front that spoke through my lips to this man who was, to some extent at least, the arbiter of their fate. So it seemed to me, speaking in a trance-like way. General Smuts was by my side and, though I had been talking with him, im-



understands so much, feels so rightly, when often he supports those who oppose peace and reconciliation, and I believe still that in his instincts always on the side of humanity and in many of his acts he compromises with reaction, makes friends too readily with Unrighteousness, sells some quality of political power, the safety of his office, for the sake of immediate triumph.

A great comrade of mine in the war on many strange adventures, used to regard George very much as Louis XIV is that of his "brother" of England—a liver. This friend, an officer in the typical of the English gentleman and South African war time—a good type in the world of its class and caste) but limited in imagination and knowledge of England, and even the war itself this little politician. Lloyd George's utterances, his Limehouse speech in

## LEADERS OF THE OLD TRADITION

"from which," said the worthy captain, "he only escaped by the skin of his teeth and the help of Sir Edward Carson," proved the moral obliquity of the little Welshman. His lip service to God and Nonconformity sickened my friend as the foulest hypocrisy. He suspected strongly that he was ready to betray Sir Douglas Haig at any moment, just as he had betrayed Asquith for the sake of the premiership, "just as he would sell the soul of his grandmother," said the cavalry officer, "for any dirty little trick in the political game."

I used to laugh heartily at these tirades. Indeed, to brighten a journey up the Albert-Bapaume road or the road to Peronne, I used to mention the name of Lloyd George *à propos* of the day's news, rewarded instantly by a warning of England's moral downfall under the governance of a man who bribed the working classes to work, bribed them again when they struck work, and established the most inquisitorial system of bureaucracy under which any people have been stifled. . . . Lloyd George has gone a long way from the time when he could be accused of revolutionary and subversive action, an enemy of Capital. By slow degrees, yet very surely, he was drawn over to the side of the Tory interest. More and more he surrendered to the reactionary policy, the hard materialistic outlook and rigid traditions of Conservatives like Bonar Law and A. J. Balfour, Lord Curzon and Sir Edward Carson, and of financial imperialists like Lord Beaverbrook, by whose underground work he had been raised to his high place. The Coalition government, founded in time of war to unite all parties in a national policy, became an assembly of tame politicians whose job was to vote solidly for any measure favored by the Prime Minister and his Conservative backers—and solidly to lean their weight against any criticism or rebellion from independent members. There was no more difference between a



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

Coalition Liberal and a Tory than between two tins of canned pork differently labeled. They were men disciplined to obey the government, to flock into the lobbies like sheep at the crack of the government "whips," to defend every government measure as good and holy, to attack all critics as traitors to the country. Whenever there was a bye-election the Coalition Liberals were supported by the government machine, and blessed by Tory Ministers of State, while Independent Liberals, the last of the Old Guard of English liberalism which had once been the glory of the nation, of Gladstonian tradition, were crushed by this unholy alliance.

The Prime Minister was the architect of this new political system which has done much to deaden the spirit of Parliament and to destroy its influence as the tribunal before which the national interests were argued and resolved. It could no longer be regarded as the safeguard of British liberty when the Cabinet possessed an autocratic power and moderate opposition was stifled by automatic majorities. It gave the extremists in the Labor world their best argument. "What is the use of appealing to constitutional government," they asked, "when the House is packed by reactionary forces, cleverly organized, unrepresentative of popular will, and antagonistic to all Liberal ideas? Direct action by strikes and threats of strikes, is the only method by which the right of the working classes may be enforced."

Lloyd George, as many other great men have done in the past, identifies himself with the interests of the nation, and the interests of the nation with himself. "*L'État, c'est moi!*" he says, with Louis XV. He is perfectly aware that, owing to his peculiar qualities of genius, there is as yet no other leader in England who can challenge him or take his place. He is unrivaled in oratory, in debate, in quickness of wit, above all in the knowledge which is the greatest gift of generalship and

## LEADERS OF THE OLD TRADITION

governance—when to attack and when to retreat. Always he has his ear to the ground, listening to the distant tramp of feet. Whenever it comes too near he gives ground, “according to plan,” and then with superb audacity and a sure touch attacks his enemy in an unexpected place. He retreats with the greatest grace in the world, yielding the inevitable with a *beau geste*, as a generous gift. In debate his success is largely due to that. He grants so much of his opponents’ argument that they are stupefied by his candor and disarmed by his chivalry. As a rule he states their side of the case with more persuasive oratory than they could dream of doing. He goes farther than they would dare. It is what he calls “taking the wind out of the enemy’s sails.” Then he breaks through their line of battle with “the Nelson touch” and destroys their last resistance with his broadsides.

This is what he most enjoys. It makes him feel young and fresh. His babe-blue eyes glow with the light of battle. It appeals to that keen sense of humor which is a large part of his power and a cause of his weakness—a double-edged weapon. For it is his sense of humor which enables him to preserve his mental poise after years of intense strain bearing down upon him from all quarters. Anxiety, dangers, attacks from front and rear, leave him strangely unscathed because he has the gift of laughter, sees great fun in it all, a merry adventure. The pomposities of great gentlemen like Lord Curzon, the preciosities of Mr. Balfour, the conceits of Winston Churchill, afford him real amusement, and when he is weary of Cabinet discussions, tired with high people, overstrained by the necessity of posing as the new Napoleon, he retires gladly to a little circle of low-class friends, and feels refreshed by their vulgarities, their lack of high morality, their cynical knowledge of life, and of him. He can take his ease among



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

them with nothing to conceal, nothing to pretend. He knows their human frailties. They know his. They have been well rewarded by him, and hope for more. He likes their loyalty, their rich jests, their memories of old times when together they heard the chimes at midnight. . . . Mr. Lloyd George will take his place in history as the most remarkable Prime Minister of England since the time of the elder Pitt. It is possible also that he will take his place in history as the man who by surrendering his ideals at the time when the world was crying out for spiritual leadership helped Europe fall into moral degradation and material ruin.

Yet time and time again during those three years of history his old instincts of idealism have revealed themselves momentarily. He made a bid for peace with the Russian people by which Bolshevism might have been defeated, but surrendered to Winston Churchill's military adventures on behalf of Kolchak, Denikin, Wrangel, and others, which consolidated the power of Trotzky, intensified the Red Terror, and broadened its areas of agony. In dealing with the problem of German reparations, he argued with the French government for a reasonable policy which would give Europe a chance of recovery and enable the German people to pay according to possibility. But he surrendered to the French militarists in their threat to occupy the Ruhr, acknowledging as he did so that if this "sanction" were fulfilled German industry would "wither" and with this withering all hopes of European regeneration would be quite blighted.

He made fair offers of conciliation with Ireland, but frustrated all efforts of moderate men for peace by approving the policy of reprisals, strengthening the powers of the counter-terror, refusing to listen to all pleas for mercy, yielding all methods of statesmanship to the stupidity of "brass-hat" brains, dealing with the

## LEADERS OF THE OLD TRADITION

Irish people, of whom 100,000 men had fought by our side in the war, and whose soul has been heroic through a thousand years of history, as though they were rebel "niggers" of a slave-driving power. Whatever peace may come to Ireland by the time this book is published, it will not be due to Lloyd George, once the young David who fought against the tyrant to liberty, but to men who so loved England that they could not bear the thought of her dishonor, as we were dishonored by the madness and badness of our acts in Ireland. The atrocious evil of Sinn Fein, the ferocity and cruelty of its guerrilla warfare, were caused by no peculiar devil in the Irish people, though the devil took possession of the worst of them, but by our long injustice, the falsity of our political leaders, the irreconcilable fanaticism of men like Sir Edward Carson and the light-hearted cynicism of men like F. E. Smith, now Lord Birkenhead, Lord Chancellor of England.

### VI

In the great crisis of English history, when, in these last three years, our national life has been in danger of ruin, and our empire itself is challenged by disintegration and decay, we have had no good fortune in leaders whose wisdom and virtue called out the allegiance of their peoples. Is there any soul in England who believes in the wisdom of Winston Churchill? Not one, I think, in all the land. Wit he has, a bold spirit of adventure, courage, stubborn self-conceit, the cool audacity of a gambler who plays for big stakes, but no wisdom—no luck, even, except in getting high office. It was astonishing in the war how unlucky he was. Men with far less ability, poor dunderheads compared with him, blundered through to great success, or at least covered over great failure and gained high reward. But Winston

nim during the war he said several times. There were a fixed idea: "This war is the greatest in the history of the world. We're playing for high stakes." It did not seem to worry him about gambling with the lives of boys—their "kitty." After the great war we had "little wars," as they were called derisively by the men. Mesopotamia was a gamble worth many million pounds a year when an overtaxed citizen was paying six shillings and sixpence of his income to an imperial government whose debts were spelled in figures beyond the comprehension of ordinary men. It was a gamble of the East, but very hazardous and far unproductive.

I remember years ago waiting in Chelsea for Mr. Churchill had gone to see him for some interview that lasted half an hour, so that I had time to examine the photographs on his mantelshelf and desk. One of them was of John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough, his great-grandfather and one of the world's greatest military strategists, venturers, and generals. He was then



## LEADERS OF THE OLD TRADITION

scrupulous as he was, as fortunate. But it has not been so, though the chance seemed to be within his grasp. Palestine, Egypt, Mesopotamia, lured him, as other men have been lured by their old spell, but the days of empire are passing because of the exhaustion of men after a war of massacre, because the idea of greater empire has died within us and given place to new ideals. Winston Churchill has been gambling with but a few "chips" in his pocket, and the forces of evolution and of fate have been heavily against him. He is not a leader of the new ideals, but a man of yesterday, with to-morrow coming near.

Where are the leaders of the new ideals? Are not all our leaders men of yesterday, in England, France, even the United States? Haphazard, I think of the leaders of England. Lord Curzon, so grave and pompous—"God's butler," as the Oxford undergraduates called their chancellor; Mr. A. J. Balfour, "dear Arthur," so perfect in courtesy, so philosophical in argument, so gracious in dignity of manner, so debonair, even now, with his silvered hairs, so hard in old ideas, so unbending to new needs of life, so intolerant of human passions, so cynical of enthusiasms and spiritual fervor, so stubborn in hostility to any new adventure of liberty; Chamberlain, the counterfeit of a greater father, able as a bank manager, correct as an archdeacon, cold as a statue on the Thames Embankment, uninspired as the secretary of an insurance office, but honorable and upright. Who else is there that leaps to one's mind as one of the great figures of history in this astounding period of the world's fate? I can hardly think of the names of those who govern England beyond those I have named. Hamar Greenwood, the Canadian Jew, notorious and marvelous, certainly for the unblushing daily denial of anything undesirable in the administration of Ireland; Mr. Shortt, his predecessor; Doctor Addison, the author of pre-





## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

posterous failures; Sir Alfred Mond, the caricature of a caricature; numbers of little men, insignificant personalities.

Sir Edward Carson, once a minister of state, for long one of the powers behind the throne of political life, stands out above them. In the memories of history he is sure of a high place. For he has played a big part in a big manner—the old style of melodrama—in the most evil character of recent history. He has stood consistently for reaction against all the influences of Liberal progress. He has been for fanaticism instead of for conciliation. He has defended cruelty instead of advocating kindness. Upon his head more than upon any other man alive rests the guilt of all that has happened in Ireland. When Home Rule was passed by the British House of Commons in 1914, he raised the banner of rebellion with the sign of the Red Hand of Ulster. Long before that Act was passed by a great majority of English Liberals and Irish members, he carried the fiery torch among the Ulster people and with the present Lord Chancellor, then F. E. Smith, as his “galloper” and stump orator, beat up all the old prejudices of religious strife, racial hatred, political passion. Protesting his loyalty to the King and the Flag of Union, he raised, drilled, and commanded a rebel army pledged to resist Home Rule by force of arms and to make a mockery of the Act signed by George V. By his consent and under his orders arms were smuggled into Ulster. They were German rifles and ammunition. By a Solemn League and Covenant he engaged the population of Ulster by oath to resist Home Rule to the death, and deliberately, with fiery oratory, and with every art of inflaming passion, he set about the work of organizing civil war.

It was only the Great War which stopped this one in Ireland, for the time being, but he was truly the author

## LEADERS OF THE OLD TRADITION

of that guerrilla warfare which has been waged by Sinn Fein against the forces of the crown. The Irish outside Ulster, the real Irish race, saw themselves threatened by the rising and arming of the Ulster volunteers. They knew the temper and purpose of these men. Some of them had seen, as I had seen in the back slums of Belfast, murderous assaults by Orangemen upon Catholic workmen who were kicked to death where they fell under unprovoked attack. Some of them had seen, as I had seen, the march past of thousands of young Ulstermen, in military formation, well set up and well drilled, grim, resolute, spoiling for a fight. Some of them heard, as I heard, Sir Edward Carson's speeches promising them "victory." The Irish of the south and west waited for the demobilization of these men by the British government. The news that came to them was the resignation of British officers in the Curragh camp, who refused to obey the orders of the War Minister to force their surrender of arms in Ulster. They began to raise their own volunteers, drilled them, but could not arm them. Then the other war happened. . . .

When it happened it seemed to promise for a time reconciliation in Ireland in the face of a great and common danger. Thousands of Irishmen volunteered for service on behalf of the world's liberty, and the Irish people of the old stock believed that at last their country would have the right to rule herself according to the watchwords of the war, "the self-determination of peoples," "the right of the little nations," "the brotherhood of man." They were treated stupidly, tactlessly by the English War Office. Their ardor cooled, and then something happened which seemed an insult to every Irishman outside Ulster. It was an insult when Sir Edward Carson, their avowed enemy, the man who had wrecked Home Rule and raised a rebel army against them, was made a minister of state.

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

How could they believe in the honesty or good will of the British government with that man in the Council Chamber? So step by step from exasperation to rebellion, punished ruthlessly, though Carson went scot free, from rebellion to general insurrection, to assassination, to guerrilla warfare, the horror of Ireland went on, and all through its agony of murder and arson, government reprisals and executions, Carson stood behind Lloyd George, a sinister figure, and no word did he speak for peace, though he is Irish, born of an Irish-woman, no word of his was for the ending of bloodshed by a truce of God, but only irreconcilable words, dividing Ulster from the rest of Ireland, though at last he had yielded to a separate Parliament.

"Do I *look* like a criminal?" asked Sir Edward Carson once, in bland surprise at being called one. As G. K. Chesterton said in answer to this question: "There is only one answer possible. You do!" Many times in those days before the war, when he was playing the Napoleon of the boys of Belfast, I used to study his face, so long and lean, with dark lines under his sunken eyes, and a strange, cynical sneer on his lips. A powerful face, but without beauty in it, or any touch of kindness or spiritual fire or human warmth, a haunted face, I thought it, and guessed it might be haunted by the memories of all the filth and corruption and greed and cruelty which lawyers pass on their way in the criminal courts. Sir Edward Carson himself is a man of honor, according to the average code. He has the manner of a great gentleman. In private life he is, I am told, genial and good-natured. Toward the end of his fight against Irish Home Rule he was, I think, even a little conscience-stricken, and did at least and at last remove his own personality from the arena of strife. But he stands pilloried for all time as a raker-up of old hatreds, old fanaticisms, old vendettas, old tyrannies



## LEADERS OF THE OLD TRADITION

—the Man with the Muck Rake, prodding up the lower passions of ignorant and brutal men.

### VII

So, three years after war, was Great Britain governed by men of the old ideas.

In France it was the same, though their leaders were utterly different in type and in temperament.

Clemenceau has passed from the scene, though the acts of his brain remain as a heritage to France. "The Tiger," he was called by his worshipers, remembering the ferocity of his temper, the swift strength of his intellectual claws, when he was roused to action in youth and the prime of life. I used to see him now and then in time of war when he looked more like a walrus than a tiger, a poor old walrus in a traveling circus. That was when he used to visit the war zone, to talk with the generals, to see the troops, to get a glimpse of that war machine which he helped to create and to control—perhaps to find death, as some French officers whispered to me, when victory seemed impossible and defeat very near. I met him several times as he sat back in a closed military car by the side of a French staff officer, looking old and worn and sad—nothing of "The Tiger." He went into dangerous places under fire and there seemed no purpose in his being there. But I think his purpose was to inflame his own heart against the enemy, to get new stores and inspiration of hate. That was the passion in him; and all the strength of his old man's soul, remembering the humiliation of 1870, seeing again the trail of the beast through his beloved country, was to live long enough to see Germany smashed and ground to dust.

He had his wish, and did a good deal of the grinding, at the Peace Conference in Paris. Keynes's portrait of

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

him will live in history, that little old man wearing gray gloves, which he never took off, shutting his eyes during speeches and interpretations which did not affect the essential purpose of his mind, which was the destruction of Germany and the advantage of France, then waking to instant activity of brain whenever those interests were involved. His outlook upon life seemed to be limited to the instant proof of French victory, in the power to extort crushing indemnities from the beaten enemy, to inflict the utmost severity of punishment, which truly as a people they deserved. He had no patience with anyone who spoke of the perils of future war, no tolerance with arithmeticians who tried to point out that Germany could not pay all the costs of all the nations after her own financial ruin, no ear to give to others like President Wilson who proposed the ideals of a new society of nations by which the peoples of Europe should be relieved of military burdens and safeguarded by common interests. He mocked at all that with a witty cynicism, sometimes rather blasphemous, as when he said that Wilson imagined himself to be Jesus Christ. It was he who invented the phrase in the early days of the war that "the English would die to the last Frenchman," though he made amends by later enthusiasm for the valor and effort of the English people. He had the gift of making a *bon mot* on any subject to which his interest could be awakened, but all his best witticisms had a touch of cruelty, without which, indeed, wit becomes humor. The old man was a great Frenchman, a great patriot of the old tradition. Without his spirit, his passion, his obstinacy, his courage, France would have been visibly weaker in her terrible ordeal. But his narrow vision could not envisage the new ideals for which so many men had fought and died—the destruction of militarism, not only in Germany, but in France, a closer comradeship in the democracies of

## LEADERS OF THE OLD TRADITION

Europe, an international tribunal before which the claims of peoples would be brought, as a better way of argument than national massacre. Clemenceau was one of those who turned the world back to cynicism and national selfishness. It might have been better for the world if he had found death at the front in one of his expeditions.

Another mind in France intrenched, after the armistice, in the spirit of the past, defying the hope of the future, was that of Poincaré, the war-time President, the later critic of England. In war time he was a nonentity, ridiculed in the *révues*, the butt of Gallic wit, which never forgot his secret retreat from Paris when the enemy was so close to the gates in the beginning of the evil days. They used to dress up comic figures in a black uniform with a chauffeur's cap, and address them as "M. le Président de Bordeaux," and in such a uniform I saw him visiting his troops and ours, a tall man, with a plump waxen face, expressionless and, I thought, merely stupid. But after the war and his Presidency, he developed a gift for journalism, and his articles had a vicious appeal to the French public because he was venomous in his criticism of the government which did not make Germany "pay"—pay all those fantastic billions of gold marks which the French in their simplicity believed were hidden in the German treasury. It was Poincaré who inflamed French suspicion against England, accused us of treachery to French claims in Syria, and of low commercial interests preventing France from reaping the fruits of victory. In all the conferences that assembled to carry out the Treaty of Versailles, England's influence was depicted by him as unfriendly to French interests, hostile to French policy. He reawakened the old tradition of "perfid Albion" at a time when every little clerk in Paris believed that English artfulness accounted for the fall in the value of the franc, and French peasants (forgetful too quickly of

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

the young bodies of English boys that lie in their soil as a pledge of friendship—six hundred thousand of them!) said, as some of them said to me, "*Nous avons gagné la guerre, mais l'Angleterre va nous manger*" ("We won the war, but England will devour us"). Alas! Alas! It was not good work by M. Poincaré in regard to England. It was worse work for Europe. Because his advocacy of an impossible sum to be paid by Germany delayed the payment of the possible sum which could have been exacted in punishment of her crime against the world. It delayed the recovery of Europe, and perhaps prevented it for all time, unless reason prevails very soon.

"Youth," said Herbert Hoover, in an interview I had with him, and which I have chronicled elsewhere, "is busy re-electing its old men. If Briand goes, he will be followed by Poincaré into deeper reaction."

Briand became Prime Minister of France, pursuing a policy which was to obtain the military domination of the Continent over the ruin of German militarism.

It is strange to find Aristide Briand in that role, as it is to find Lloyd George the leader of the Conservative party; and, indeed, the careers of these two men who for a time have represented the reactionary policy of the Imperialists in France and England are strangely similar in every way.

Like Lloyd George, Aristide Briand was born of humble parents who stinted and scraped to make their boy a lawyer, and like Lloyd George again, the young Briand was an ardent democrat of advanced and revolutionary ideals. His "home town," as the Americans say, was Nantes in Brittany, and here, after his legal studies in Paris, he lounged about in cafés and wine taverns, talking politics to the local demagogues, and waiting for briefs which did not come. Suddenly he leaped into fame for his defense in a *cause célèbre* which he made for himself.

## LEADERS OF THE OLD TRADITION

It was in this way, as the story has been told to me. A peasant murdered an *agent de police* in a particularly brutal manner. To him, as he sat in his cell, went young Aristide and asked permission to act as counsel for the defense.

"There is no defense, m'sieu," said the peasant, already prepared for the guillotine.

But when the case was called, Briand stood up and said, "I will defend the prisoner." He called no witnesses, for those of the prosecution told the plain, brutal truth. But presently he began his speech for the defense. He exalted the poor besotted man into the sublime peasant type of France, and the *agent de police* into the representative of the "brutal tyranny" of the French government. With wonderful oratory he described the life, the ignorance, the hard unending labor, the very soul of peasant life in France, as Guy de Maupassant revealed it, as Zola made it terrible in realism. The papers reported the speech, which lasted many hours, and went on from one day to another. France rocked with excitement. In the courthouse the jury were moved to tears. The peasant was acquitted, "without a stain on his character," and young Aristide Briand was embraced by his friends. Nantes was not big enough for him. He went to Paris with a few shirts in his bag. He called on Jean Jaurés, the Socialist leader, then editing *L'Humanité*, and sent up his card.

"Are you that young lawyer who defended the peasant at Nantes?" asked Jaurés.

Briand smiled and bowed.

Jaurés embraced him.

"What can I do for you, *mon vieux*?"

"Give me three hundred francs a month and a seat in your office," said Aristide Briand.

He became a journalist. He wrote scathing articles against the government. He entered politics and made



When I met Aristide Briand before  
Minister of France, hated as a renegade  
Jean Jaurés, Gustave Hervé, and all  
He had forged the weapon of the general  
it in their hands. It was they who  
strike him down.

The general strike was declared,  
paralyzed. Not a train "marched,"  
a wheel turned. Paris was cut off  
danger of starvation. At night it was  
ness, and I remember the gangs of  
down from the Quartier Latin to the  
right bank, with lanterns and bits  
lugubrious dirges with the enjoyment  
kind of drama. But the government  
and order, were threatened by general  
Briand showed the courage in him.  
challenge of the general strike by  
several classes to the colors. That morning  
It was penalty of death if they disobeyed  
they dare disobey? That was the question  
Briand risked not only his own life, but  
History tells that they obeyed—the  
in the Frenchman's heart, loyalty to

## LEADERS OF THE OLD TRADITION

gant with its long mirrors and gilded chairs, and I stood by the side of a writing table where once Napoleon Bonaparte sat as Emperor of the French. I chatted to one of the secretaries, and there were others in the room. Presently the door opened, and a tall, heavy-shouldered man with a shock of black hair and a pale face with somber eyes stood staring at me.

"Monsieur Briand!" whispered the secretary, hurriedly, because I stared back, not realizing that this was the man, but strangely held by those dark eyes.

He talked in a friendly way, explained the gravity of the situation in France, the need of strong action to restore the authority of government, his faith in the loyalty of the French people. It was not so much what he said that impressed me then, and now, but the personality of the man, the look of intense fire within him, a kind of mysticism or spiritual exaltation in the depths of that dark gaze of his. He was more typical, I thought, of a revolutionary leader than of French bureaucracy.

During the war he bided his time, took no great share in national events. There were many who thought he would be the Prime Minister of a liberal France, looking beyond the immediate fruits of victory to a new pact of peace in Europe between the democracies of many countries, rising to the ideal of a League of Nations. Instead, he demanded the advance into the Ruhr which might have been a mortal wound to white civilization in Europe by insuring a war of the future in which the last of our youth would perish. For that policy could only be maintained as long as France held the power of the sword, and one day that will weaken.

### VIII

I write these things not in blame; not even in criticism of these leaders of the old tradition in Europe.



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

By all the probabilities of psychological law not a man who reads this book of mine would have done otherwise than what he did, or would have been nobler, wiser than any of them. They did their best to the height of their quality and character, to the limit of their national vision.

Looking at the settlement of Europe after the war, and the terms of peace, in the light of old precedents, with reference to what was done after other wars and other victories, and with no reaching out to new ideals, they fulfilled their duty loyally, each man, to the immediate interests of his own country, as they seemed to him, each man striving for what gain his nation might get. One cannot blame them because as leaders they rose no higher than the ethical average of political morality. One cannot criticize them because they were little statesmen and not great philosophers—the pioneers of a new world. One only laments that in this time of enormous crisis in the world's history there appeared no men or man among us with a genius great enough to call humanity to a new advance upon the road of social progress, to call upon all that surging of emotion and idealism which was at work in the hearts of peoples because of the agony they had suffered and their dreadful disgust at the thing that had happened.

The failure of the leaders of the old tradition was due to their utter inability to realize that the war which had ended and the victory gained were unlike all others in history.

They did not understand, being poor men at arithmetic, that most of the accumulated wealth of European civilization had been destroyed in those four and a half years, leading to such exhaustion among victors as well as vanquished that the industrial life of Europe was threatened with decay and death.

They did not know that by the intricate and delicate

## LEADERS OF THE OLD TRADITION

machinery of modern industrial civilization depending upon a liberal interchange of credits, raw material, exports, imports, and all activities of working folk, the ruin of one great people must of necessity injure the commerce of all surrounding countries and lower the average of wealth, the normal standard of life, in every other nation.

Their imagination was not educated to the power of gauging the effect of the enormous loss of man power and of spiritual strength, upon the work in fields and factories of all peoples who had been stricken in the conflict, so that for years their output would be decreased and their markets damaged, with the inevitable result of widespread unemployment and increasing poverty.

They believed, in their simplicity, that, despite the hideous calamity of Russia, once the granary of Europe, and a great market, notwithstanding the sentence of death they proposed to pass on Austria, and the collapse of a great part of central Europe, they could avoid their own bankruptcy and revive their own prosperity, by getting all the costs of war from Germany. Some of their own economic advisers warned them that Germany was also ruined, and that only by future industry spread over innumerable years could she ever pay for the actual damage done, and that even then, if she paid back by an enormous output of manufactured articles produced by the sweated labor of a slave population, the whole balance of trade in the world would be upset and the industry of England, France, and many countries would be undermined. At the same time that they wanted to make Germany pay all the costs of all the victories, which she could only hope to do by an enormous vitality of industry, fatal to the competition of other countries, they wanted to keep her so damaged and depressed that she could not rise again as a menace



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

to her enemies. The problem was stated by an American humorist in the form of a question, "How can you keep a mule so weak that it cannot kick you and so strong that it can pull the plow?" I have not found an answer.

Apart altogether from the economic condition of Europe, so desperate that it needed the wisest doctoring of men regarding its disease, not passionately, but with scientific gravity, with the knowledge that all European countries are members of one body, in which the disease of a vital organ means a spreading poison throughout the system—the spiritual results of the war were entirely ignored by the leaders of the old tradition. They acted as though there had been no change in the minds of men and women during that conflict, whereas the psychology of peoples had undergone enormous changes.

The peoples had seen the meaning of modern war in which the civilian was as much a part of its destructive activity as the soldier himself, in which all humanity was overwhelmed by monstrous engines of destruction. The victor peoples did not desire vengeance so much as security from future war. The vanquished, after having spilled torrents of the blood of youth in vain, were ready, for a little while at least, to accept all the penalties of defeat, if they were but given the hope of regeneration. Long before the end of the war the German peasants and artisans had abandoned the ideals of militarism to which they had rallied in the early days. They called the war "The Great Swindle," as I read in hundreds of letters captured from their dugouts. On the Russian Front they were infected with the pacifist philosophy of the Soviets before it became the bloody terror of the Bolsheviks. On the Western Front they acclaimed the Fourteen Points of President Wilson. Something might have been made out of that new psychology by new leaders who did not assume that the psychology of the peoples was the same in 1919 as in 1914.

## LEADERS OF THE OLD TRADITION

In Germany the leaders of the old tradition also betrayed the new hopes. The German people, by the stupor of defeat, an inherited sense of obedience to their ruling caste, and a national hatred of revolutionary violence, failed to overthrow the caste which had led them to disaster. The Junkers remained in their strongholds and not one of them was hanged up to his gatepost. The old bureaucracy of the Empire remained as the bureaucracy of the Republic. Noske, Scheidemann, Ebert, were no more democratic in spirit than Bethmann-Hollweg or Doctor Solf. Hindenburg and Ludendorff still remained heroic figures in the imagination of men who remembered that those names had been linked with great victories on many fronts where the German race had fulfilled its pride. The very depths of their defeat, the hatred of all the world to them, caused reaction in the mind of the German populace, who had cursed them as tyrants when the war was on, and now softened to them, swung back to them in admiration, as heroes of the time before the great humiliation. The German people, immediately after their defeat, might have flung off their old castes and tyrannies with a great cry of liberation, and asked for the generosity of the world's democracy. I believe they were for a time ready to do so, if any great leader had been with them to help. I believe they are ready even now, if any leader in the world would help them. But instead, they allowed themselves to be led by the old, crafty, autocratic minds of the Prussian tradition, whose sole idea of patriotism was to shirk honest payment on any basis of justice and to scorn repentance for great crimes. Their sole idea of statecraft was to bluster and bully before the victor nations and their own people, and their one hope of escape from the consequences of defeat was to divide the Allies by intrigue, and to recapture their own power by economic forces created by the slave

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

industry of their half-starved workers. The Supreme Council of the Allies, and the chauvinists of the Allied nations, played into the hands of the German leaders of the old tradition. They declined to follow Wilson's lead of giving German democracy a chance, on condition that German Junkerdom should be destroyed.

By the many injustices of the Peace Treaty which put large Teutonic populations under the domination of Poles, Italians, and Czechs, killed the economic life of Austria, and imposed burdens upon the working people of Germany which seemed to them beyond human tolerance, the Allies hardened the temper of those people and stifled their hope of deliverance from their own old tyrannies. They were made the pariah people of the earth. No nation would receive them. No enemy would forgive them. No hope would be given to them. It is no wonder that gradually they harked back to their old national sentiment and, being denied a new international ideal, turned to the old caste again, which at least had defended the old nationalism. They entrenched themselves in hate against hate, abandoned thoughts of a new freedom for the hope of a new vengeance.

I am not one of those who minimize the guilt of Germany in the war. I remember great brutalities, abominable wickedness. Nor do I ignore the claims of justice for due punishment of crimes, and the absolute right of France to the reconstruction of her devastated country and all the ruins of her state. But I believe that if the leaders of the old tradition had been greater in leadership and had called all people to a new philosophy of international life for the sake of future peace and the common weal of Europe, the German people would have paid more willingly, according to their power, and would have labored with all their might of industry to build up the ruins they had caused. Because they and their fellow workers in all countries would have been



## LEADERS OF THE OLD TRADITION

inspired with enthusiasm for the healing of wounds, so that free peoples, cured of the old disease of war, might march joyfully to new conquests in peace. There was a chance of that, and I am not alone in thinking so. All the thinking men and women I meet in many parts of the world believe so too—realists like Hoover, idealists like Robert Cecil, humanists like Anatole France and H. G. Wells. But the leaders of the old tradition would not have it so.





## II

### IDEALS OF THE HUMANISTS

#### I

**I**N this world of cynical old people who stare forward to the future with a melancholy which is masked by an ironical contempt for human nature—has it not proved itself incapable of wisdom or of any sane scheme of progress?—and who have a secret or avowed conviction that Europe is doomed by the fatal consequences of recent history, there are still numbers of men and women, in every country, with an ardent faith in the possibility of building a nobler system of life than that which existed before the ruin into which war plunged the European peoples.

These idealists are brave folk! To their opponents the cynics, they seem ridiculous, though charming—dear, unpractical creatures looking at life through a mirage of sentiment, ignoring plain and frightful facts, trying to twist human nature to standards of conduct which mankind is totally incapable of adopting, fighting, with pretty or futile phrase, against the monstrous powers of evolution, racial pressures, physical distress, primitive and ineradicable instincts of greed, cruelty, and passion which belong to the human animal.

Certainly the history of these recent years seems to be a death blow to the idealists, and it is surprising to find some of them still alive—some of the old guard—scarred and wounded in their souls—but still valiant, undeterred, ardent. Remember what they aimed at and

## IDEALS OF THE HUMANISTS

how tremendously they failed, as they knew they had failed, on that day of August, 1914, when the great armies moved and Armageddon came.

Take a man like Jean Jaurés, the leader of the French Socialists, one of the old guard who fell in the fight. He was really a sentimentalist, though he roared like a lion. With a gift of violent oratory at his command whenever he wished to stir the emotion of mobs, as I saw him stir them in the old days of Paris, intolerant and abusive of a religion which seemed to him the protector and ally of the evil powers of military force and class privilege whom he was fighting, he had a philosophy and a faith which, in its simple motives, in spite of ironical skepticism, was really Christian in its idealism. He believed, beneath all the superficial irony of French wit and the stark realism of French intelligence, that human nature in the mass is capable of "salvation" and that its conscience is divine in essence, ready to choose the way of righteousness, rather than of animalism, if liberated from ignorance and filth and from the false spells put upon it by corrupt rulers. He believed—and it was a wonderful faith for a Frenchman—that the peoples of all countries, even of that country which still held Alsace and Lorraine and maintained the menace of an army which threatened France with death, might be united in a common brotherhood, based upon the common interests of a free democracy and upon claims of human nature nobler than national rivalries, the love of wife and babes; the denial of blood lust between laboring men; the right to peace and joy in life among peoples in possession of their soil, with ample security of life's necessities; a little margin of wealth for beauty and recreation for every toiler, and freedom from the tyranny of governing classes, or overrich castes, who made use of the bodies and souls of humbler men for financial warfare or imperial ambitions. That in its

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

essence and impulse was the faith of Jean Jaurés and of millions of other men who listened to his flaming words. So I heard him proclaim it once in a *salle de manège* somewhere in a slum of Paris, where the bodies of two thousand *cheminots* (the railway men) were pressed closely and hotly together, when from their sweaty clothes came a rancid odor, and the heat of their breath was stifling in the whitewashed hall.

He was a revolutionist, though without cruelty in his heart. He proclaimed "The International" and had a childlike optimism in the conversion of the German people to a pacifist gospel. He spoke grandiose words about "the solidarity of labor" (the new spell word of the toilers) and helped to organize the *Confédération Général du Travail* with Briand, who defeated it when he became Prime Minister for the first time, because it threatened to overthrow the social structure of France, which had once been his own ambition.

Jean Jaurés was the champion of the antimilitarists and attacked the system of the three years' service in France with unceasing eloquence which made him feared and hated by those who were preparing for the "inevitable" war with the old enemy. He was bold enough—in France!—to denounce patriotism as a worn-out creed, an evil perpetuation of old feuds, a narrow passion that would lead indeed to a new and inevitable war unless it was broadened by new meanings—and no one who knew Jaurés believed that his abuse of patriotism meant any lack of love for France, because he had an adoration for the French spirit, for her poetry, for all her beauty, for Paris in every nook and corner haunted by old ghosts. His enemies said he had weakened France by his life's work, and that I think was true in so far as he succeeded in limiting expenditure on armaments and military preparations. By the failure of his philosophy, the utter breakdown of his hope to

## IDEALS OF THE HUMANISTS

build a bridge of peace between the laboring folk of Germany and his own, all his turbulent activity had helped to make France less certain of victory when she was faced by the ordeal of war—because he had worked, not for the victory of war, but of peace, when there was no peace. On the first day of war he was struck down by a crazy patriot, and I saw his coffin carried through the Tuileries, followed by many who paid a false homage to his dead body out of fear of the mobs who had loved him. But the mobs marched with their battalions to save France, as he would have marched now that his hopes had failed of a world united in security and brotherhood.

In the opposite camp—among the traditional enemies of France—there was another leader of democracy who was working for the same ideals as those of Jaurès, in a less inspired way. It was Edward Bernstein, the leader of the Social Democrats. He, too, had preached the “solidarity of labor,” the common interests of working folk across the frontiers of nations, and the doctrine of international peace. Those to whom the Jewish race is a bogey of evil working by subterranean ways to overturn the structure of civilization, that Israel may reign supreme above its ruin, will scoff at Bernstein’s name and denounce him as one of the dark hypocrites of that frightful conspiracy. I thought him an honest man, within the ordinary limitations of political leaders, when I met him in Berlin before the war, and I think so still. So honest in his estimate of actual conditions that he confessed his despair to me and the weakness of his own leadership because he saw the inevitability of the Armageddon that was coming, owing to the conflict of powers and castes and traditions which had more sway over the people than any teaching of his.

I remember him now—though between then and now is the war that was fought, and a world that has

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

changed—sitting in a swing chair before a roll-top desk, telling me things that did not startle me, because my imagination was incapable of adjusting itself to their significance. His exact words I have forgotten, but he spoke of the lack of education in international ideals among the working classes of Germany. They had adopted international catchwords, sincerely but superficially. His teaching and that of his predecessors had not broken down national impulses, the vainglory of national pride, the passionate belief in the invincibility of the German army, the sense of imperial destiny taught in the schools, the influences of militarism, monarchy, and racial loyalty which were inculcated by the whole system and philosophy of German *kultur*.

“If war comes,” said Bernstein, “the Social Democrats who have been theoretical pacifists will march as one man against the enemy, whoever that may be. Our ideals are still in advance of the psychology of peoples.”

He spoke the exact dreadful truth, and at the outbreak of war Social Democracy in Germany betrayed its faith, unable to resist the call to a false patriotism which seemed higher than any other gospel, though its aims were devilish. So most other pacifists in all countries found themselves compelled to declare a moratorium to their hopes of international comradeship and fell back to national aspirations on behalf of a victory which, for the time being, seemed—on both sides of the line!—decreed by God for justice' sake and human progress.

How foolish, then, how vain and mocking to poor human toilers in world ideals, seemed all the efforts of their life toward a larger fraternity of man! That was one of the worst and most shocking tragedies of war, for to these simple souls—simple most of them, in spite of hard reading and long research into the history of thought—all their faith came toppling down to ruin.

## IDEALS OF THE HUMANISTS

Whatever God they had worshiped in the secret shrines of their hearts seemed to have betrayed them. The devils laughed at them, crying, "How now, simpletons?" For they had believed that human nature had reached a stage when it would refuse to go back to the old barbarities of wholesale slaughter in the fields of Europe, and that the level of common intelligence among "civilized" peoples had been lifted above the possibilities of such a general massacre as now must happen among them. Elementary education had made great strides. The peoples had learned to read. They had read the little pamphlets of the Fabian Society. Sidney Webb had lectured to them. H. G. Wells had written his socialistic novels for them. G. B. Shaw had ridiculed them out of old superstitions. Across the English Channel, Anatole France was the last of a long series of ironists, from Rabelais onward, who had mocked at the slavery of the common folk under the superstition of political and tyrannical dogmas which turned them into gun fodder for the big game of war, played by imperialists and financiers. Even out of Russia, still under tyranny, still illiterate in the mass, had come a new prophet of peace and human brotherhood—Tolstoy. He had written war and peace among his other books, stripping war bare of its old illusions, showing the falsity of its "glory," its squalor and cruelty and stupidity. In all great countries of Europe—except poor Russia, still in chains—the idealists had seen with eyes of faith a general awakening of mass intelligence to the high sanities of life—the reasonable arrangement of international peace, the closer comradeship between "Labor" in all countries, a higher standard of decency and comfort, with a little leisure and learning for all citizens of civilized states, whose well-being at home might be secured by the abolition of military burdens, following the establishment of international arbitration. That



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

blessed word—arbitration!—had been the spell word of the idealists. Long and ardently did they support the labors of the Hague Tribunal—the great guaranty of world peace. In big books and in booklets, how many of them devoted their time and money to bring these ideals to the mind of the masses in a spirit of self-sacrifice for humanity's sake! Then out of the blue sky the bolt fell, and with its falling destroyed all that they had striven to do, all their spiritual toil.

In every country of Europe there were men and women stricken like that. I knew some of them. With some of them I had worked, now and then, half-heartedly, being of more frivolous mind.

### II

I saw the tragedy of one of them a few days after the outbreak of war, in Paris, when the first trainloads of *mobilisés* were going eastward to Toul and Belfort and the frontiers of Alsace and Lorraine—few northward where the great shadow was creeping close—and all the streets of Paris were filled with the passion of eternal partings. It was George Herbert Perris, one of the most untiring laborers on the road to international peace. I describe him, not because he was a famous man, though his activity was known in many countries, but because he was a type of many similar minds in England. All his working life a journalist and public speaker, his pen had never betrayed his principles, and his enthusiasm and ardor had been boyish, genially intolerant of all poor blockheads and reactionaries who did not believe with him that victory was in sight—victory for a world court of arbitration, for general disarmament—(how fiercely and with what joyful irony he had exposed the commercial activities of armament firms who grew rich out of war-making!) and for a fraternal democracy of peoples across the frontiers of nationality. He was a

## IDEALS OF THE HUMANISTS

disciple of Tolstoy and had written his life with reverence, though he could not follow the old man through all his gospel, which, in the end, was near to madness, for Perris was practical and in a mystical sense unspiritual. He had sheltered Russian revolutionaries in his suburban home, was the friend of men like Kropotkin, and his pen had traveled over reams of paper recording the martyrdom of those who struggled for Russian freedom. He was, in his character and activities, typical of many groups of intellectual workers who in London, Liverpool, and other English cities devoted themselves to committee work (after hours of professional toil to keep small homes above the poverty line) on behalf of the "Brotherhood of Man" and all downtrodden folk from Camden Town to Congo.

In Paris I found him, after he had been carried back with the tide of refugees from the frontiers of war—he was the delegate to a meeting of the Peace League!—and in the shabby bedroom of the little Hôtel du Dauphin in the rue St. Roch he confessed his agony to me. I remember now the gray look of his face, and his nervous movements in that little room, and his cry of despair.

"This makes a mockery of all my life," he said. "Everything that I believed is now untrue. Everything I hoped is broken. This puts back civilization a hundred years. There is only one explanation and that is of no avail. It is that Germany has gone mad."

In some such words he spoke to me, hour after hour, while down in the street Frenchmen were trudging with their wives to the railway stations, where they would say "Adieu!" and go to unknown horrors.

"This war," said Perris, "the abominable criminality of the German attack, has killed me as a pacifist. Until Germany is defeated I am a believer in war to the death, for unless Germany is punished for this crime and utterly broken, there can be no hope for the world."



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

He, too, like thousands of other men, declared a moratorium of all international ideals for so long as the enemy remained unbeaten, but for Perris, as for some others, this change of spirit was like tearing out his soul. The cold passion of his hatred for the German war lords who had caused this agony was religious in its devotion. He became a war correspondent with the French army, whose valor and sacrifice he learned to admire with all the homage of his heart. One of the greatest pacifists in England was decorated with the Legion of Honor for his services to the French army, and kissed on both cheeks by the French general who conferred it. After the war I met my friend again, older by more than the four and a half years of war, worn and frail after the strain of it. He was at Geneva, in the Hôtel du Beau Rivage, during the Assembly of the League of Nations, and we had long talks together. He had gone back to his faith and philosophy before the war—indeed he maintained that he had never changed any of his ideals. But I think that with him, as with many men, the years of war had been a separate adventure of soul, something apart and distinct from all previous thought and imagination, having no relation to previous qualities of character. Afterward the experience of it vanished as a nightmare, and men tried to pick up the threads of the previous life as they had left them, and wondered why they failed and fumbled.

Perris was marvelous in the way he seemed to have gone back to his old way of thought. I think he emerged from the war with his previous ideals sharpened and hardened and deeper dug, though with more caution in his method of persuasion, and with less intolerance of opposition. But he was not so cynical as younger men who surrounded him, and his laughter rang out in challenge to colleagues who jeered at this work of the League of Nations. "Reactionaries!" he cried.

## IDEALS OF THE HUMANISTS

"This League holds all the hope of the new world that is coming. You expect too much of it at first. We are on the right lines and doing good work for the healing of the wounded world." So he spoke and worked until he died, there in Geneva, a veteran in the cause of international peace, though the oldest and the newest nations were even then digging new trenches against the international ideal!

At the funeral, when I stood by the coffin of my friend, I saluted him as one of the Old Guard. Others, old comrades of his in the work of his life, stood up to pay their tribute to him, and men like G. N. Barnes, the Labor Member and Privy Councilor, remembered the old ardent days when they, like him, had believed that humanity, free in common sense, would have no more of war on the universal scale . . . Perris was but a type, and a noble one, of many self-sacrificing men in England who did the spade work of a new world without public recognition or hope of fame.

### III

Rewarded by fame, immensely fortunate in material success and recognition of many-sided genius, one idealist is working away with the energy and precision of an American reaper-and-binder to clear the ground of human intellect from its undergrowth of ignorance and prejudice, so that a fair new world, dedicated to human reason, may be built by youth thereon. That is H. G. Wells, one of the most whimsical prophets and philosophers in the history of ideas. In many ways he must take first place among the idealists who are trying to scheme out a new social structure, because he is more valuable than any of them, most audacious in his far-reaching plans, most definite, precise, and practical in his program, and not so "wild" in his methods of

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

argument as those who would tear down the existing structure regardless of human tragedy before attempting to build upon the ruin. H. G. Wells has the artfulness of the "restorer" of ancient monuments, who, by underpinning and other architectural dodges, produces a brand-new building without outraging public sentiment by obvious destruction of the old. By this method he is able to avoid the charge of being a "revolutionary," his articles are printed in newspapers supported by the defenders and producers of "Capital," and he is invited out to dinner with moderately respectable people, including British generals, to whose headquarters he went during the war with a special pass from G. H. Q.

That is a little strange, when one considers the present nervousness of English society and the deep suspicion of the military mind on the subject of revolutionary literature. For H. G. Wells is more revolutionary in his ideals than men of the trade unions or of the Parliamentary Labor Party, who are branded as "Bolsheviks" by their Conservative opponents. While they are thinking mostly in terms of national politics, to secure more democratic control of the national state, H. G. Wells is theoretically flinging down frontiers, overturning the last remaining dynasties, forming a universal alliance of Labor and establishing the United States of the World. It is the very magnificence of his conceptions that disarms all sense of fear among those who are fearful. They read his visions of that new world state as with amusement and interest they read his "War of the Worlds" and his "Food of the Gods," things too fantastic to be frightening. Then, too, he is labeled as a "funny man." The author of *Kipps* and *Mr. Polly* and *Tono Bungay*, vastly entertaining even to "nice people" of the leisured classes, is not, they think, to be taken seriously when he begins to write

## IDEALS OF THE HUMANISTS

about God or the English political system. Perhaps they are right, instinctively and surely. It is the tragedy of H. G. Wells (though he is not a tragic figure) that his sense of humor and the spirit of comedy that presided at his birth prevent him from stirring the faith and emotion of people who are seeking guidance through the jungle darkness of this world. Though he holds a light before him, sometimes a clear-shining light of common sense, they suspect him of Pucklike tricks that are only a lure into deep thickets. In spite of the beauty of some of his thoughts (as in a book like *Mr. Brillling Sees It Through*, where he was more sincere, more emotional in his sense of life's tragedy than ever before), they hear from afar his goblin laughter, see the mischievous glint of his sideways glance. They are not sure, either, of any divine fire in the man, any true nobility of soul which must be the attribute of those who would lead humanity to a higher range of goodness. In several of his books he thrusts forward a little vulgar man as his hero—he exaggerates his defects—rather below the ordinary standard of the social code, not because of the things he is pleased to do, but because of the way he is pleased to describe them. He finds a comical pride in thrusting this vulgarian before the fastidious, as though to say, "We are all like this, and I dare say so!" But the teachers of the world have not been like that. They have been great sinners, but not little cads. They have agonized over their frailty, not found it rather good, and anyhow quite usual as a habit of the times.

It was the desire of H. G. Wells to show his minute particular knowledge of the modern type of youth and middle age in the great new middle classes which made him put in these touches for the sake of truth. And they are true—true to the little lives of millions whose adventure of soul is confined by small proprieties, and

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

whose sins are little sordid, secret immoralities. But that microscopic treatment of modern life has hampered Wells in his larger visions, and tripped up his devotees. I think his sense of humor, his easy tolerance of common weakness, not tender-hearted and all-embracing, but critical and sarcastic, trips up his own steps toward the higher ranges of thought. He stops to laugh at himself, as when he said to me once, after an earnest conversation about the attributes of the Divine Power, "You would hardly believe how much I am nuzzling up to God!" His mysticism fell with a crash; his groping for some higher authority than human reason was mocked by this guffaw. In his country house, in Essex, described in all delightful detail in the first chapters of *Mr. Britling* (even the German tutor was drawn to life), and in his rooms in London I have seen H. G. Wells among his friends and watched the man who, beyond any doubt, is one of the leaders of modern thought, one of the most active, untiring, ardent, courageous "reformers" of this society. It was surprising to me that I felt no sense of being in the company of greatness, nor of being inspired by the light of genius. He made little jests, shrewd little comments, amusing and interesting to hear, and he was very watchful of his company, as I saw by the quick, penetrating, sideways looks which registered them and all their small tricks of manner in his photographic mind. But he had not the sure dogmatism of a man who has grappled with truth and with the elemental problems of life and come with some certain faith out of dark hours. Nor had he the smiling irony of men who have come through such hours, not with any certain faith, but with a tender and melancholy skepticism which makes them benevolent to life, very tolerant, wise in the knowledge of their ignorance. H. G. Wells is assertive, dogmatic like a school-teacher, rapid in thought, as the well-

## IDEALS OF THE HUMANISTS

trained journalist he is, whimsical, restless, and uneasy. In his work he is like that—quick, journalistic, cocksure, slick in the craftsmanship of his ideas. Yet, after all, astonishing in the universal range and energy of his endeavors, in the courage of his ideas, the gallant way he takes all the world for his province, all history for his background, all the future for his prophecy, all humanity for his microscope. He has, perhaps more than any living writer in the English language, stirred up the common mind to think beyond the little boundaries of suburban experience, to see his own little life as in a mirror, to feel in closer touch with the big movements of the human family, and to desire more knowledge of history and science in order to lift the human race, and his own personality, to a cleaner and nobler stage of social progress. That is a big thing to do, and H. G. Wells, in spite of little characteristics not belonging to the highest genius, has been big in endeavor and achievement up to that point. With the clean, sharp weapon of his pen he is now educating the middle-class mind in the international idea, which has the universal brotherhood of man as its great ideal.

### IV

The "Mob" (as it used to be called with contempt), not belonging to the middle class, but to the ranks of labor—the intelligent mechanic, the factory hand, the skilled laborer—is being educated toward the same ideal by pamphleteers and tract writers unknown by name to all outside that class, and by local oratory and debating societies, and private conversations between shifts of work, for mixed up with idealism is the hard selfishness of narrow trade interests, a cruelty of hatred of the class above, and the wild fervor of revolutionary propaganda which has no motive but destruction.

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

Between the incalculable ferment that is at work among the masses of working people in all countries of Europe—as yet we do not know what will rise out of that yeasty thought—and the theoretical adventures in reconstruction by the intellectual reformers, there is an immense chasm of psychology so far unbridged. There is, as yet, no one in Europe—at least I do not know him—who speaks with the voice of the people, whose words find an echoing thrill in the heart of the people, whose leadership and magic personality are acknowledged by the people.

No writer has appeared of late to be the interpreter of the great multitude, as Charles Dickens was in his time and within the limitations of his contemporary thought. No poet like Victor Hugo has arisen to call to the soul of his folk with a music of words which was magic to every Frenchman, so that they vibrated to his rhythm, were inspired by his passion. No man of action has humanity behind him, ready to go where he beckons, as once Napoleon led his legions in the name of liberty and glory to many battlefields where their bones were strewn. No religious teacher has come out of study or cloister to utter thunder words before which the multitudes tremble and fall down, in obedience to him, or words of love giving life a new sweetness even in sacrifice, and a sense of richness in poverty. Our leaders of thought seem to be enormously ignorant of the instincts, ideas, and purposes of humanity in the mass, of their suffering, their agonies, their hopes, their passions. Too many of them talk from high, bleak altitudes, in the accents of cultured castes, in unpopular language, and without the fire of human love to warm the heart of the crowd.

Typical of such men seems to me Lord Robert Cecil in many ways, by many qualities, the leader of the new political idealism in English culture. He stood for

## IDEALS OF THE HUMANISTS

honesty and honor and truth at a time when the bargain between half-hearted Liberals and Tory reactionaries had resulted in a Coalition Parliament which voted blindly at the dictates of the Prime Minister and his Cabinet, surrendering their duty of criticism, defending every ill-conceived act, every extravagance of policy, all unwisdom due to the narrow reactionary brains of the Prime Minister's masters (his very soul was surrendered to them as a bargain for political kingship), with a tame acquiescence hardly known before in the history of the House of Commons. Although a Conservative by instinct and education, above all by the immense influence of his family history and the almost sacred traditions of the House of Cecil as the divinely appointed rulers and protectors of England, intrenched against revolutionary change and dangerous tendencies of thought (had it not been so for four hundred years?), Lord Robert's sense of honor, his sensitive repugnance to injustice and brutality, his ethical faith in Christianity applied to political principles, made him revolt from the intrigues, bargainings, sinister adventures, and callous indifference to the ideals which had been the watchwords of war—liberty, the self-determination of peoples, the war to end war—revealed by the Ministers of the Coalition and their rabble of sycophants. He at least was a gentleman, fastidious and nice in his sense of honor, contrasting with the liars, the sharpers, and low-bred adventurers who surrounded the Prime Minister, like Pains, Bardolph, Nym, and Pistol, and the wild cronies of Harry's youth.

His vision of world peace was on nobler lines than national greeds, and as the representative of South Africa (which gave him greater liberty of action without committing the Cabinet to his policy) he did more than any other man in Europe to uphold the ideals of





## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

the League of Nations and to fashion the Assembly out of a chaotic crowd, without precedents of procedure, into a real Parliament of Nations before which the foreign delegates could bring their proposals for orderly debate.

His long, lank figure, with hunched shoulders and ascetic, monklike face, arrested the imagination of all members in an Assembly which represented twenty-one nations, and they watched his appearances on the platform, his repeated risings to points of order, and the cold fervor of his enthusiasm for abstract principles and legal niceties, with an unabated interest in a strange psychology. One Frenchman by my side in the gallery, looking down upon him, made a grotesque comment in English which I am sure was a mistranslation of the phrase he wanted to use. "This Lord Robert," he whispered, "is like a debauched clergyman!" What I fancy he meant to say was an "unfrocked priest," and certainly there is in Lord Robert Cecil's face and manner the continual suggestion of a monastic soul, or, rather, an ecclesiastical quality. He seems a dedicated man, superior by ascetic habit to all human frailties, with the dryness of the old schoolmen in his method of thought. He stands as a rare figure in English political life, fine in courtesy, never stooping to baseness, an aristocrat of intellect and temperament. With broader qualities, more "fire in his belly," more love and knowledge of common folk, he would be the ideal leader of a new march forward in the adventure of English life. But that ecclesiastical manner and the legal twist of his brain and an unconscious air of superiority to fellow men (not insolent, but inherent in his very being) will never gain for him the following of great legions.

Yet as one of the "Intellectuals" in England, he has a high and worthy place, and is a standard bearer in the spiritual conflict against the forces of evil which



## IDEALS OF THE HUMANISTS

threaten to submerge the European peoples. For the larger liberty of Ireland, from coercion and reprisals in a miserable time of terror and counter-terror, he has spoken according to the old standards of English justice and honor when these were forgotten by ministers of state and their hirelings in dirty work. For moderation toward the beaten enemy, with justice based on reason rather than passion, when all nations of Europe must unite for economic recovery or surely perish, he has worked with intellectual devotion and risked the anger of a Hun-howling press which still has power to break a public man if they hate the virtue in him. He has never swerved in his belief that force is the worst way of argument if ever reason gets a chance for settlement by consent, and that is his gospel for the recovery of Europe, if fools will stop their folly, as he once told me, while his long arms clasped his long legs and his ascetic face was just as a craftsman monk would have carved a prior in stone for a cloister effigy—conscious of authority, strong in self-discipline, dry in humor.

### v

A powerful little group of Intellectuals—not revolutionary, but “advanced”—surround H. W. Massingham, editor of *The Nation*, and he is certainly one of the guiding spirits in the intellectual life of England. A strange man I have always thought him, in brief encounters, with something dark, mysterious, and Celtic in his psychology. Something cankered him years ago, some secret of his soul—disappointed ambition or tragic contempt of human nature which would not go the way he hoped. Long before the war he was a bitter man, darkly melancholy, and with a cold ferocity of attack when he drove his pen against political opponents or

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

literary pretenders. He has always been prone to see virtue in all countries but his own, and has been such a lover of liberty that he has almost defended German militarism itself when defeated by stronger force. Anti-imperialist, anti-protectionist, anti-everything in which the Tory mind has found its gospel, and the popular crowd its war cries, he has been the most acid critic of all that John Bull stands for in character and caricature, and John Bull, not the paper, but the type, has hated him for years as a traitor, a crawling pacifist, a coward, and a dirty dog. He is not a traitor, but a sensitive plant to any touch of brutality or injustice that seems to him hurtful to the good name of England and to the human family. He so hates cruelty to the under dog, the weak, the ignorant, that he is cruel himself in his attacks upon those who seem to him bullies in their nature and methods. He is almost morbid in his hatred of spiritual and physical pain, and agonizes over the sufferings of men and women and animals and birds in this cruel conflict of life. The war to him was the supreme downfall of the civilized ideal, the great darkness of our soul and time, and in his office in the Adelphi he suffered with the sufferings of all the wounded, blinded, agonized men.

He never wanted "victory." He wanted only "peace." He was what the French called a *défaitiste* because for a long time before the armistice he clung to every hope of a negotiated peace, strove by all the power of his pen to destroy the policy of the "knock-out blow," and was the fierce, unrelenting critic of ministerial stupidities in the management of the war, not because he wanted the war better managed, but quicker ended, by popular disgust. He had but one glimpse of war's horror on the battlefields when he went on a few days' visit to the western front. He had been invited by the "propaganda" side of the Army Intelligence which

## IDEALS OF THE HUMANISTS

had a simple belief that a sight of the men in the trenches and at the guns would convert any pacifist into a howling "Hun hater." Massingham came and saw. He stood by a battery of six-pounders up by Posières in the Somme fields and every round fired seemed to hurt him like a nail driven through the head. The roar of artillery and the answering scream of German shells seemed to vibrate every quivering nerve in his body and brain. The leprous look of those shell-plowed fields, where no blade of grass grew under the flail of steel, deepened the pallor of his face, and in his eyes was the horror of a man who sees hell before him.

Yet in moral courage Massingham has had few equals, for he dared to attack a government invested with absolute power over the liberty of its citizens, under the Defense of the Realm Act ("Dora" as the wits called it), which in time of war and long afterward was a sharp and ruthless weapon against those who spoke or wrote against its acts, authority, and judgment. He challenged popular opinion at a time when it was passionate and brutal. His letter box received many threats of violence, sometimes a menace of death. He paid no heed to them, but one friend of mine, loyal to this man of ice and fire, used to follow him secretly when he left his office at night, to be close if any ruffian made a pounce. In allegiance to Massingham, many of them his lifelong associates in revolt against cruelty wherever it might be found, are such men as Henry Nevinson, J. L. Hammond, H. N. Brailsford, H. M. Tomlinson, knights-errant of the pen, crusaders all on behalf of the Holy Land which dwells in their vision.

### VI

For years before the Great War, Nevinson was a follower of little wars, as an old type of war corre-



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

spondent, always hating the stupidity of that way of argument, and its beastliness, yet always allying himself with any people fighting for liberty. Between the wars of nations, he was an onlooker of revolutions and civil strife, writing on the side of the under dog, a partisan of those who challenged tyranny.

Nevinson was bravest and most quixotic when he faced the ridicule of his own people by espousing the cause of the militant suffragettes. Many times in the days of that strange feminine adventure to which cold logic, self-sacrifice for political ideals, and a sense of humor were mixed up with wild hysteria and the viciousness of thwarted women, have I seen Nevinson, as the one male escort of suffragette demonstrators forcing their way through rowdy and riotous mobs into which mounted police were charging and foot police were overwhelmed by the pressure of human weight. Nevinson's tall form, with silver hair and bronzed face, had a knightly look then as always, but men chose him for their rough handling. He was a tough customer to handle, and once at the Albert Hall when he sprang to the rescue of a woman who had been struck down by a coward's blow, he gave battle to a company of stewards who fell upon him, and dented several of them before they flung him out—this noble, mild-eyed man, so full of courtesy, so benignant, so wise and witty, such a scholar and gentleman.

We met in the Great War, in strange and menacing places. In the first days on the Belgian coast, as when we paced the esplanade at Nieuport when our shells were screaming overhead from monitors at sea, and presently German shells answered back and smashed into the houses about us. Nevinson strolled up and down, up and down, with a most tranquil courage. . . . Our ways parted, and then met again toward the end of the war when he came again to the western front,

## IDEALS OF THE HUMANISTS

walked toward German machine-gun fire as though it were but raindrops, received the surrender of German prisoners from a crowded dugout, though quite unarmed, and as a war correspondent received salutes from all the army, because he looked as a "field marshal" would like to look.

It was inevitable that Nevinson should champion the Irish cause. It was waiting for him. Has he not been on the side of all little nations demanding liberty? In Ireland after the war he has been chronicling in his cold, unimpassioned way the history of murder and retribution, ambush and reprisal, with an intellectual bias in favor of the Irish people who are suffering under all this anarchy because they will not surrender their claim to be a nation, separated by race and faith, by long and tragic memories, by fires of hatred inflamed in the passion of this recent history, from England, which seeks to impose her rule as on a subject people, by force of arms. Death dodged Nevinson in the Great War. Some bullet will find him in Dublin or in some civil strife at home.

### VII

And Tomlinson, whom Nevinson loves as I do—what a strange assistant-editor to Massingham, his chief! Massingham's blood runs cold, but Tomlinson has a burning fever in him. Massingham has the fastidious manner of an intellectual aristocrat, rather arrogant in his range of classical and modern knowledge. Tomlinson, born down Wapping way, the son of a skipper, belongs to the people of poverty and humility, except by a genius which lifts him above them and most of us, however polished. In his youth he discovered the magic of words and found that he could capture its secret. To him words are jewels. By digging for



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

them as they lie hidden below the rubbish of commonplace speech, he finds in their sound the harmonies of beauty that lie deep in them, and wonderful architectural values when he goes building with them. Yet he never uses words as a substitute for thought, for more sensuous music. He is a realist in his way of thinking, cutting his way deep and ruthlessly to truth, seeing life with its cruelty, its stupidity, its incoherence and fumbling. He has written two good books, *The Sea and the Jungle* and *The Port of London*, but it is as a journalist, mainly anonymous, that he has done much of his best work. More than as a writer, his personality counts with those who know him—a whimsical personality, with a face like a friendly gargoyle on a Gothic church, smiling down at humanity passing. He has an ironical humor that makes one laugh with twisted entrails when he is mocking at life's pomposities. A son of the people, he remains a lover of the people, though he knows their ignorance, their sheeplike instincts, their frenzies and passions. The war, of which he saw much as a war correspondent, left him with a bleeding soul. He groaned over the agonies of youth, over all that wasted flower of life, and afterward he understood the agony hidden in little homes in mean streets—the homes of the people he knows best—and all his passion burned in him, consuming him with rage and bitterness, because of the misery of broken manhood and womanhood caused by the brutal sacrificial cruelty of war—of that war which in his soul he believed was forced upon the world not only by the Germans, but by evil forces of greed and corruption in high places on both sides of the fighting line, using the spirit and bodies of humble folk, spellbound by false watchwords, as the counters in this game of devils.

A most humorous ironical man, in spite of his sense of tragedy, I remember his comical grimaces in strange

## IDEALS OF THE HUMANISTS

places of the war, as when, through a snowstorm, we came out of the shattered village of Kemmel in Flanders—where the old dead in the little cemetery had been torn out of their coffins by shell fire—and passed a civilian in evening dress without an overcoat, walking quietly to this hunting ground of death. Tomlinson smiled at me most whimsically, tapped his big forehead, and said, with a kind of joy, as though the sight confirmed all his convictions: “Mad! Mad! We’re all mad!”

In the early days of the war, before he wore the uniform of a war correspondent, he was wandering about an ammunition dump close to the lines in darkness illumined only by flashes of shell fire. A Tommy stared at his strange figure like the Ancient Mariner in a cloth cap, walked round him three times, and said, “Who the ’ell are you?” “I’m the representative of the *Times*,” said the delectable Tomlinson, modestly and hiding the awful fact that he was also representing the *Daily News*. “Yus, bloody likely!” said the gunner, convinced of his capture of a spy. “You come along with me.” And indeed nothing could have been more unlikely than that Tomlinson should be the representative of the *Times*, or that any civilian soul should be about an ammunition dump at midnight under shell fire.

Deaf in one ear, he had the advantage of that on the battlefields, and when, outside Bapaume, a monstrous shell came screaming, he cocked his head on one side and asked, very simply, “What bird is that?” But the best memory I have of Tomlinson is when with quiet ardor he converted a typical British general to a tolerance of socialistic ideals. . . . The general afterward lost his job, undermined perhaps by this philosophy.

And now Tomlinson is among the idealists, trying to





## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

argue the world to sanity and stinging stupidity with whips of irony.

### VIII

These men whom I have taken haphazard as types of intellectual leadership in the world after war are all members of groups thinking, talking, writing, organizing, and each group and every individual in each group is backed up by friendship and correspondence with other minds in England, and through Europe, of the same sympathies and ethical outlook. It is to some extent a secret confraternity whose members know one another not by any badge of membership or by fellowship of political parties, clubs, and committees, but by the exchange of a smile, an ironical lifting of eyebrows, a quiet comment on some new act of government, a new tyranny of reactionary powers, another stupidity of passion thwarting the reconciliation and peace of people. They meet, as I meet them, in railways trains on the Continent, in wine taverns and tea shops, in newspaper offices, in apartment houses of New York and Washington and Paris, and in London drawing-rooms after dinner, where little groups gather for conversation, as once before the Revolution in France the Intellectuals came to the *salons* to discuss the existence of God and the social origins of humanity. All over the world now, as far as I know it, such groups of men and women are talking, talking, in very much the same way, with the same doubtfulness about the future of civilization and a faith in certain ethical remedies which they think alone may save us.

In an apartment house of Washington, where one lady and five men sat curled up in easy chairs, smoking cigarettes, sipping the last drops of some precious liquid, discussing the present troubles of Europe and the way of escape, I thought then, with an uncanny sense of the

## IDEALS OF THE HUMANISTS

intellectual communion of human thought, of all the millions of such little companies who then, at that hour, in poor rooms or splendid rooms, were talking in the same strain, reaching out to the same hopes, relapsing perhaps into the same melancholy. One brain among us dominated the general discussion, the cold, analytical brain of Frank Simonds, one of the greatest journalists in the world, who did not sit back, like the others, in an easy chair, but at a desk, alert and keen. He sorted out the intellectual actions and reactions of the United States, England, France, and central Europe, as a chemist analyzing some compound. He balanced the credit and debit side of European economy, finding all in a bankrupt state. He examined the claim of the Allies to German reparation and dismissed them as impossible by the laws of arithmetic, and then weighed the advantage against the disadvantage of a strong Germany undermining the trade of the world by enormous exports, by which alone she could pay the money demanded, and a weak, dismembered Germany, ruining the world by lack of power to trade at all, to buy raw material, to send back manufactured goods. He sketched out the inevitable policy of France, keener to kill Germany than to save herself, discovering that by no freak of luck could she get back the price of all her losses so that her next chance of satisfaction lay in thrusting Germany deep into the mire, though all Europe would slip after her into the bog of ruin. His eyes bright with intellectual vision, his shrill, discordant voice rising into ironical laughter whenever sentiment tried to challenge his realism, leaving no loophole which could trip him up in argument, he prophesied the doom of Europe. A doom inevitable, except through one door of escape, and that a quicker abandonment of national egotism, a fellowship of nations, tearing down their trade barriers, demobilizing old hatreds and stand-

and start afresh on a new pha  
among the countries of Europe  
many fools about. We ought to  
Society for the Suppression of Im  
when I told him that so many of us

## IX

It was in the Lotos Club of New  
to one of the great leaders of the  
great doctors of humanity, when  
sat in my bedroom and talked of the  
and done and failed to do for the  
was in March of 1921, just before he  
the new President, Harding.

My room was littered with shirts  
ordered clothes, opened and unopened  
had had no long warning of his coming  
(after a long journey) for tidiness  
to that, but for a hour and a half  
talking moodily, almost introspectively  
of sadness, except just now and then  
humor sparkled in his eyes for a second  
out again. He is a successful man.

## IDEALS OF THE HUMANISTS

He spoke of the state of Europe. The condition of Austria, he said, was worse now than a year ago, fed by charity which he was still organizing in America, but not being healed of its social disease, for charity could do no real good, though it was a duty to do what it could in rescuing. He described his own work after the armistice as a kind of economic dictator, a position of which he was glad to get "quit."

America had "pulled out" after spending a billion and a half dollars upon the relief of the stricken countries, and for a time he had organized a system of credits and supplies which had helped to keep central Europe from certain starvation. But he could do nothing with European statesmen. They would agree on a reasonable conclusion when assembled round a table, and then go away and do nothing to carry out the idea—do everything to thwart it. All the new states got busy putting up frontiers against one another, with customs dues and all kinds of barriers to free intercourse and exchange.

The Poles would not help themselves, and endless intrigue prevented recovery and health. From the Poles in America 100 million dollars had been sent to committees, and if that money had been used as credit for food supplies, the starving population would have been well nourished; but the money was passed through clearing houses of London and Paris so that Poland received perfumes, soaps, luxuries for her profiteers, instead of food for her people.

In Serbia there was an immense store of surplus food which would have been easy of transport to the stricken populations of central Europe. But Serbia would not sell it eastward. She sought higher profits and sent it to Italy, France, and England, while food for her neighbors had to be sent all the way from America to keep them alive.

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

“Europe must unite on economic lines or perish,” said Hoover, and he did not speak lightly nor use careless phrases. Those words on his lips were a sentence of death, if Europe did not heed his warning.

I spoke to him of my hope in a new leadership, and in the coming of youth, and he smiled when he answered and said: “Youth is busy re-electing the old men. If Briand goes, he will be followed by Poincaré into deeper reaction.” He had seen no signs of a new faith in the League of Nations, but only the old men burking the real issues and playing with truth.

Then he turned his thoughts to America and told me the tremendous difficulty of moving American imagination in the direction of a world policy. The size of America, the provincial character of the American mind in the great Middle West and over the whole continent, makes them incapable of understanding how they are touched by disease in central Europe. He had tried to make them understand. When farmers of the Middle West had asked him: “What is Europe to us? Why is the price of hogs dropping down?” he had told them that before the war each individual German had obtained 25 grams of fat per day (if I remember the figures), which was not enough even then for the mass of industrial workers, and now they obtained only 12 grams of fat. The price of hogs in the Middle West depends on the German standard of fat supply. . . . But they could not understand and do not remember.

Hoover hoped that President Harding would call a world council and help to build up a new economic union in Europe and cause a plea for gradual and general disarmament. But he feared that if he did so the old diplomats of Europe would come to thwart it with their old animosities and subtleties and national intrigues. Yet he hoped. . . . It was because he hoped

## IDEALS OF THE HUMANISTS

in a growing common sense, in the promise of youth, in the spreading of truth, that he went on working, instead of retiring to a private yacht in some sun-soaked sea, abandoning the world to its doom. . . . He saw just a glimmer of light ahead.

### X

I perceived among all these individuals and all these groups, clubs, committees, and associations of Intellectuals in Europe and America, certain clear, definite, and simple ideas, however vaguely or subtly expressed, however complicated by social and ethical philosophy. They amount just to this: That the war was a homicidal insanity which exhausted all the reserves of wealth in Europe, and left such burdens of debt that they will never be redeemed. That, in spite of great human heroism on all sides, it left human nature in Europe demoralized and spiritually weakened. That the arrangement of peace ignored the devastating effects of war in all nations and the complete upheaval of its economic machinery, and created new boundaries, burdens, and rivalries which can only be maintained until another explosion happens, more monstrous than the last and destructive of white civilization as we know it and like it.

What way out, then? What escape from this approaching doom, whose shadow creeps over the souls of men? Not by diplomatic conferences of the old school, establishing some new balance of power, not by one nation grabbing at the last reserves of another, not by military occupation of defaulting countries, nor financial jugglings to postpone an evil day of reckoning in this nation or that, nor by assaults on Capital by Labor or attacks on Labor by Capital, but rather by a complete change in the structure of civilization and in the

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

hearts of peoples. Under the impending menace of general ruin they believe that humanity in Europe may be inspired to make a clean jump across the abyss that opens before them, instead of crawling slowly to it and falling in. It must be a jump to a new world in which there must be utter abandonment of the heritage of national hatred and superstitions, spell words and fetishes. The idealists demand a new religion of humanity based not upon force, but upon spiritual comradeship among common folk. They preach not a revolution by blood, but a revolution by love. They believe in love of country—the love of the beauty of one's countryside, of one's speech, of one's poetry—but not in the hatred of other people whose speech is different, though their beauty is as ours. They believe in the liberty of nations, but in a communion of international peoples, not denying one another's liberty, rather protecting it, because of common interests, sympathies, and understandings across the present frontiers. Their hope in a possible cessation of war is founded upon their faith in the common sense of humanity, if it can be liberated from superstitions, and the baser ignorance in which it is kept by artful brains, now that frightful experience has taught them the lesson of its folly. They admit the passions and cruelties and greeds still inherent in the heart of man, but they have a wonderful optimism in the power of ideals and the average virtue of common folk. . . .

Unpractical visionaries! Dreamers out of touch with reality! Sentimentalists regardless of plain facts! Revolutionists with rose water! "Intellectuals" playing with the fires which will consume them when the passion of brutality, brutal life itself, makes an *auto da fé* of such weaklings. So the brutal mind, sure of history, with no faith but in force, gibes at them.

Gibe for gibe, the Intellectuals can hold their own.

## IDEALS OF THE HUMANISTS

With witty poniard they can stick the bull fellow who rages at them. They know they will never live to see the fulfillment of their hopes, nor any quick harvest come from the seeds they sow. In secret hours they despair because of so much stupidity. Often they face the futility of their idealism. Many times they mock at their own little prescriptions for a world disease, and stare moodily at the approach of a greater downfall in which all Europe will be engulfed. Yet they go on talking, writing, trying to link up with one another, and to leaven a mass of ignorance, attacking tyranny in its strongholds, brutality everywhere, cruelty which hurts them more than its victims, teaching beauty, liberty of thought, large toleration, the right of humanity to joy and peace. Of another world beyond the grave they have no definite belief—not many of them. God means mostly to them the ideal love in the minds of men. They are humanists with their eyes on the purpose and the agony and the compensations of this life of men and women. Perhaps if they claimed religious authority, spoke as men ordained by a Divine Spirit, they would get a greater following, and lead the world forward on the impulse of some new religious fervor. But this would alter all their character. It would rob them of irony, of self-mockery. They would no longer have a tolerant understanding of human weakness, an indifference to the smaller frailties, a delicate sense of humor. They are not priests, prophets, or fanatics, but humanists. It is doubtful if many of them are of the stuff of martyrs, though I think Tomlinson would die with a whimsical melancholy on behalf of the truth as he sees it, and others, like Nevinson, are careless of death.

They are not of much power in the world. There are other forces moving secretly, stirring in the psychology of peoples, working in subconscious evolutionary ways





### III

#### THE NEED OF THE SPIRIT

##### I

THE spiritual fires of white civilization seem to have burnt low since the war. In many countries they seem to have flickered out, leaving nothing but the dead ash of a hard materialism or the red embers of selfish passion—nowhere very visible the white light of the sacrificial flame.

Many simple souls were startled by the rapid decline in ordinary morality which happened in war time, still more by the manifest lowering of spiritual ideals after the armistice among those who had seemed exalted to wonderful heights of self-sacrifice and spiritual purpose. They could not understand—it was hard to understand—how men who had been so obedient to discipline in the face of death, so reckless of their own lives and self-interest for their country's sake, should come home with sordid, squalid instincts, hating work, desiring nothing but material pleasure, striking, sometimes rioting, in senseless conflicts between Capital and Labor, rebelling against authority, demanding the fleshpots of life with hungry appetite. Still less could they understand—those aloof, observing souls—how the war, which seemed to lift up human nature by the enormous enthusiasm of patriotism, could be followed by so many revelations of widespread immorality, general laxity of relationship between men and women, and distressing signs of a coarseness and cruelty of mind—

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

in all classes—not noticeable before the war. Ministers of religion are aghast at the materialism of the times, and cry out in horror from their pulpits, not acknowledging their own share of guilt. Newspaper moralists record each new aspect of social degeneracy, forgetting that the press which pays them is in a great measure the malign influence producing this mental condition of mass psychology.

The fundamental mistake of those now surprised by the sudden “slump” in idealism is that the war was really a time of spiritual exaltation to all the people engaged in its passionate drama. To many it was. To many young men about to die for their country’s sake, in the early days at least, it was a time of divine renunciation of earthly hopes, as one sees in the poems of Rupert Brooks and in the letters of thousands of boys to thousands of mothers. So also among the civilian peoples behind the lines there was a great stirring of spiritual faith in the excitement of unaccustomed service and sacrifice for their country’s sake. The love of their fighting men was a great love, and that was good. They were ready to deny themselves everything so that “the boys” might have an extra touch of comfort, some proof of love in their ordeal. They were ready to suffer privation, danger of air raids, the nervous rack of war time, not only for the sake of their youth in the fields of battle, but for the sake of the victory of ideals over the forces of evil. They were simple, clear-cut ideals in simple minds. Right over wrong, liberty over tyranny, and the safety of the mother country—or of the fatherland! Nothing can ever lessen the miracle of all that, at its best, in its purest nobility.

Alas for the frailty of human nature, there were other strains of emotion, not pure or noble, in the deep tides and currents of war enthusiasm. All passions were intensified in that time, evil as well as good, low as well

## THE NEED OF THE SPIRIT

as high. The love of country and of young kinsmen was horribly blended with hatred and blood lust in the minds of many men, and more women, in whom the emotion of hate had a degrading and coarsening action. It was inflamed and kept at fever heat by atrocity stories—many of them false—and by a long, careful propaganda of hate, not ending with the end of the war, but continuing long after peace. It was the press (sometimes the pulpit) which stirred up and poked about the lowest instincts of the mob mind, with appeals to vengeance, cupidity, cruelty. That is not good food for the soul for seven years. It has a poisonous reaction, and deadens the sensitive nerve cells of the mind.

In England after the war I have been astonished often by the insensitive quality of the popular mind to events which formerly would have aroused instant emotion, of indignation or pity. Horrible accounts of the starvation of children in central Europe, narratives of whole populations, as in Vienna, stricken by disease for lack of fats, did not touch the imagination of many people. Others reacted to such stories with harsh hostility. "Let them die!" was the answer I had from ladies I know. "Why should we feed boy babies who will grow up to be Huns?" That was logical in its cruelty and perfectly reasonable, if life is to be based on the law of cruelty and human nature to be divided always between "Huns" and "Allies." But it was new in modern England that women—not all, of course, but quite a lot of them—should be so callous of suffering childhood, even in the enemy's country.

More surprising, more callous, was the indifference of the mass of English people to the reign of terror in Ireland. It was not that they hated the Sinn Feiners, or upheld the policy of reprisals by the Black-and-Tans. Theoretically the ranks of labor were sympathetic



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

to the Irish rebels and hostile to the government's policy of coercion. Actually they did not care. The dreadful episodes of that struggle, ambushes and arson, assassinations by this side and the other, men dragged out of their beds and shot before their wives and children, the hanging of boys in batches, all that horror of guerrilla warfare and military repression, left English psychology stone-cold or just mildly interested. Before the war a storm of passion would have swept over England. There would have been a fierce partisanship, wild meetings, passionate protests, mob demonstrations. After the war only small groups of "intellectuals" excited themselves about the state of Ireland. In the streets I used to read newspaper placards with a sense of sickness—"Cork in Flames"—"British Soldiers Ambushed near Dublin"—"Five More Policemen Shot in Ireland"—"Extensive Raids in Irish Towns"—"More Creameries Destroyed by Crown Forces." But the crowds went by, indifferent, in the Strand. No flame of indignation lit up their lackluster eyes. Ireland might be swept clean by fire and sword, for all they cared. Some filthy divorce case, the legal argument as to whether an archdeacon stayed at a hotel with an unknown lady, and always the latest betting results, were of far more importance in the mind of the people.

The murder of a girl at the seaside by two degenerate young soldiers filled columns of the daily papers and the reports were read eagerly by millions. It was the sex interest which lured them and made those dull eyes light up. The killing of women in Ireland by British soldiers "shooting up" Irish villages did not raise a flicker of interest among the general public in England, nor command more than a few paragraphs in English papers. Enormous calamities, like the great famine in China, did not arouse one throb of emotion, one pitiful tear, as far as I could find, among English folk, and I was, like

## THE NEED OF THE SPIRIT

them, unable to respond emotionally to the most tragic happenings, unless they were of immediate personal interest. The immense long-continued tragedy of war had destroyed all power of emotional reaction to new and more remote abominations. "Oh, hell!" was the attitude of mind of the average man to any such episode. A subtle coarsening process had overtaken the most refined minds and blunted their finer sensibilities. The least refined minds had just relapsed into brutishness, no longer held up to decency by the ethical standard of the world.

### II

For some time after the demobilization of the armies civilian populations were astonished and shocked by the disorderly conduct of many home-coming soldiers. Indeed, signs of trouble appeared immediately after the armistice, and the very men who had done their best to win the war, which was won, suddenly adopted an attitude of revolt against all discipline. On the western front there were disorderly demonstrations by bodies of men demanding instant demobilization and insulting elderly officers who threatened them with field punishment. To Whitehall and the War Office—the very Holy of Holies—came troops of soldiers from seaside camps in lorries and ambulances seized without permission. They demanded instant hearing from any general in authority. They were not to be awed by red tabs or brass hats. The power of life and death seemed to have gone out of those symbols of command, to the profound annoyance of those who wore them. "The men have been infected with Bolshevism. Foreign agents have been at work among 'em," were words spoken in a frightened way by elderly gentlemen in London clubs. "I'd turn the machine guns on to them," was the advice of others who, not long before, had been

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

acclaiming those men as heroes and the saviors of old England. What had happened? In another book—*Now It Can Be Told*—I have shown a little of what had happened in the spirit of the men who had fought—  
—their disillusionment with the ideals of war, their  
—bitterness with the old men in the high places of command, responsible for much unnecessary slaughter, their sudden revulsion against discipline when the coming of peace seemed to break all need of it, their desperate desire to get out of khaki and into “civies” again, and their utter sickening weariness of “spit and polish,” parade, all the deadening routine of military life as soon as the passionate purpose of the war had gone out of it. It was not Bolshevism that had been at work, but the ordinary actions and reactions of human nature.

Worse things happened later, things not so natural or pardonable as the haste of men to be demobilized, though partly due to the fret of waiting for freedom. Soldiers—and especially Canadian soldiers—ran amuck in camps and towns, attacked police, looted shops, stormed town halls, fought in a brutal, demoniacal way with the guardians of law and order. There was something unreasonable in these sudden gusts of fury, something that looked like madness, as in the case of young officers even who took part in these affrays and afterward swore, as I think sincerely, that they could remember nothing of how they came to be mixed up in the rioting, or what they had done. It was just a sudden lack of self-control, a sudden uprising of ungovernable and unreasoning passion.

It was part of that general disease which doctors called “shell shock,” though it afflicted men and women far behind the lines, aloof from shell fire, the long nagging of the war upon the nervous system until it was all worn and frayed, the high tension of war excitement

## THE NEED OF THE SPIRIT

which suddenly snapped when the armistice was signed, and the subconscious effect of war's liberating influences upon the animal and moral restraints of civilized nature. The killing of men had been the work of life, the purpose of life, for four and a half years. To the gentle lady knitting comforters for the Red Cross that purpose had been a subconscious influence. She was aware of death in the mass, the slaughter of the world's youth, the blood and iron of war. Her gentility had been a little hardened. She was no longer shrinking and sensitive at the thought of life's brutality. Even she, with her taper fingers, had lost something of refinement. How much more the man who had walked through fields of dead, whose daily training was to kill better, who had killed! The miracle is that so many thousands of decent men—so many millions—remained decent, untainted by blood lust, clean in mind and heart. It was inevitable that others should be brutalized, and that when, after the war, some accidental happening stirred their anger, or their lust, they behaved like primitive men. They had been taught "caveman stuff," as the Americans call it, while they sat in lousy dugouts under fire. There was an epidemic of foul crime in England, France, Italy, other countries. Young soldiers murdered lonely girls after horrible brutality. In drunken brawls they fought one another like gorillas. . . .

During the great coal strike in England, the government called up the Reservists to maintain order in case of rioting by the miners and the army of unemployed. For the most part the miners behaved like lambs, but at Aldershot, Woolwich, and other places the Reservists, all "veterans" of the Great War, broke bounds and started looting and rioting until they were dispersed by cavalry. "Bolshevism!" whispered frightened politicians, using the new spell word to explain every symptom of social unrest. But in this case what was happen-



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

ing was the disgust of men thrust back into the discipline from which they had escaped, after too much of it and after they had thrown it to the four winds in the liberty they had found in peace. Some of them, by that sudden relaxation of restraint, after a life in which every hour of their day was ordered, had lapsed into a weak lawlessness of soul, incapable of self-control, nervy, restless, lazy not of set purpose, but spiritually lax, and with a mental and physical resentment to concentrated work. In the mass psychology of peoples with the war experience, there was this loosening of old restraints, and after the enormous, driving impulses of war, life seemed purposeless and without any sanctions for discipline. No new impulse higher than self-interest replaced the spiritual ideal of sacrifice. The mob, without leadership, contemptuous of those who claimed to be leaders, cynical of idealists who had brought the world to a sorry pass, followed its own instincts, devoted itself to its own immediate interests, while many people lower than the average of the crowd (whose instincts are mainly sound) just dropped back into the selfishness of the brutes and adopted the brute code as their law of life.

### III

One strange after-effect of war, startling the moralist—judge or jurymen—by its devastating epidemic, was the ruin of homes by divorce. Here it seems, except to fanatics who favor divorce as something good and admirable in itself, is a clear proof of degradation in social morality—the slippery slope to perdition in Christian civilization. I hate figures because often they confuse the mind instead of clearing it, but I must quote here the divorce statistics of England, which truly show in a dramatic and shocking way the feverish

## THE NEED OF THE SPIRIT

increase in numbers of those who, in a country still instinctively jealous of the marriage laws, have gone to law to break their partnership.

Year	Dissolution of Marriage		Nullity of Marriage	
	Husbands' Petition	Wives' Petition	Husbands' Petition	Wives' Petition
1913.....	312	234	13	18
1914.....	436	397	7	16
1915.....	348	320	6	6
1916.....	515	421	11	7
1917.....	641	305	12	20
1918.....	727	355	15	14
1919.....	1,216	413	10	15
1920.....	2,351	690	22	27

In 1921, for which I have not the complete figures, the numbers mount higher, and in one week at the beginning of May six hundred cases were heard in the courts.

It will be seen that in 1920 there were over three thousand divorce cases, or ten times as many as in the year before the war. Yet it is probable that that number is insignificant in comparison with all the homes in which husbands and wives live in miserable alliance, their spiritual bond having been utterly broken, though they do not apply for dissolution of marriage for lack of money or in fear of scandal. It has been a world malady directly due to the war in many strange, subtle ways. "I do not know one man who went to France now living with his wife again," I was told by an American lady of high social standing. I protested against her exaggeration, knowing many American soldiers still happily married, and asked her to think again and modify her statement, but she said: "I may be unfortunate in my friends, but that is actually my experience of their home life."

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

How can one account for this tragedy of lives? What was the influence of environment and adventure which led to such disloyalty between those who had loved? For in many cases these divorces are not revelations of ordinary immorality by men and women of low character. On the contrary, many of them have been brought before the law by people of exceptional culture, of good social reputation, and of long-trying virtue. Middle-aged men, fathers of families, who lived honest humdrum lives, contented and happy to all appearances, suddenly broke away, changed all their character, betrayed women who had been utterly faithful to them. So was it with many women. With younger couples it is easier to understand. During war time they married in haste and in peace time repented at leisure. When the menace of the war was present, youth took what it could quickly, before death could intervene, grabbed at life and immediate joy. I knew many boys—airmen and company officers, machine gunners, and observers—who knew that seven days' leave might be their last chance of life. One more little "stunt" above the clouds, one more little "show" across No-Man's Land, and for them no more. They loved life. Its beauty was boundless to them. They felt their youth with vital intensity of desire. To get "all in" while they had the time was their philosophy, and marriage with a pretty girl was part of the life they would not miss, though it might be only for a splendid week. It was so easy. The girls were of the same philosophy. They too were grabbing at life, seeking fulfillment of youth, before all the boys died. It did not matter very much which boy they married. They were all so splendid and so brave. They were life—under the menace of death. . . .

Youth was right. In the mass it was wise, with sure instinct. Mother Nature created their impulses to

## THE NEED OF THE SPIRIT

repair so much destruction of life. But there were penalties. Life's little ironies broke in to mock at romance. Many of the boys did not die, though the odds were against them. They came home, badly or lightly wounded, nerve shaken, fretful with the strange and deadly boredom of peace for which they had longed. They could not get jobs, so many of them, for so long a time, and after trudging for jobs came back home dispirited, bad-tempered, quick to resent the little irritations of domestic ways. Young wives were very lonely in war, and hated loneliness and sought the companionship of their husbands' friends, home on leave. "Allah is great, but juxtaposition is greater." Poor children of life, so ignorant of their own quality, their own emotion, the tides of human nature. Here is nothing to marvel at, especially at a time when all laws of life were being rudely challenged, all faith was being questioned, and religion was irreconcilable in many souls with war's peculiar code.

More difficult to understand was the sudden breakdown of older men, not ignorant of their own nature, and with long records of loyalty. "How is it," I was asked by a frank-spoken lady, "that men with ladies as their wives, beautiful women, all the highest refinement of civilization in their homes, and all the tradition of training behind them, fell to the first little slut they saw in the streets of Paris, or went astray in low haunts?" It was not quite so bad as that, though it was bad.

I explain such mysteries in a groping way. The war was a mighty aberration of all restraints built up by the careful checks and boundaries of the civilized code, that powerful system, stronger than religion, which we know as Public Opinion. Human nature is always secretly in revolt against these checks. There is an errant libertism in the soul of every man who sees en-

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

ting byways of pleasure, deductive short cuts to joy, across which is written the harsh word of the social law, "No Thoroughfare." Everywhere through the quiet life of peace in quiet towns, these signboards are staring in the sight of men, and because of the watchful eyes of Public Opinion they dare not trespass. But war flung all these signboards down. Public Opinion altered its own bearings. Its fixed principles slipped. In the convulsion of war it lost its faith. Men went out to France or other fronts in an adventure which changed all life and themselves utterly. It had no link with the past, and its future was most uncertain. These men in khaki uniforms were not the same men as those who had been in civil clothes, with white collars and cuffs and all, in city offices or pleasant drawing-rooms. They were in a different world and a different life, doing things utterly remote from all their previous experience, and for the most part skeptical of ever returning to the life they had known. They were revitalized. The old trammels fell from them. They were but soldiers of fortune in an unending war. They, too, had to grab quickly at any passing chance of pleasure, lest they should be too late. And the job they had to do was ugly, dirty, cruel. It would end, perhaps, in a dirty kind of death. Once up in the trenches and they would be far from any kind of life's beauty. Behind the lines, in Paris, Amiens, London, there was still beauty, feminine softness, which was the opposite of all that harshness of war's discipline. The rustle of silk sounded better than the scream of a shell. They were not disloyal to their wives at home. They were other men in another world—born anew. So they argued, and wondered at themselves.

After the war they were different again. When they went home they pretended they were the same. They

## THE NEED OF THE SPIRIT

dressed up in the same old clothes, sat at the same old table, and knew, so many of them, that the men they pretended to be were dead and that they were masqueraders of their own ghosts. The woman opposite was no longer the wife of this man who sat glancing at her now and then with searching eyes. She had changed, too, during these years of war. She too had had secret adventures of the soul. They had actually been divorced before quarrels, open infidelities, passionate endeavors for reconciliation, the cold and dreadful certainty that the old love was dead, led them to state their case before the court.

Strange and terrible revelations! After twenty years of married life, men with grown-up children whom they had loved devotedly sought a dissolution of marriage with women who had believed in their eternal faith—or it was the other way about. Some hideous, tremendous impulse, long hidden in subconsciousness, had broken its fetters. Men after the years of war had a sense of second youth at their home-coming. They did not desire a return to the old life, but the beginning of a new life. Some other woman offered them that. After the tremendous excitement of the war impulse they craved for some new impulse equally dominating and exciting. New love or its counterfeit provided them with this sensation: I believe in hundreds of cases this was the psychology of their broken partnership, and in the woman's case it was no different. Yet by explaining we do not condone. "*Tout savoir, c'est tout pardonner!*" That is true, but the weakening of resistance in human nature to the evil of disloyalty is a serious matter for civilization. Lack of self-control is not to be lightly disregarded, nor replaced by easy allegiance to "the spirit of liberty." Christianity, anyhow, must be shipwrecked on these shifting sands, and even the inherited code of morals which in many

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

countries, as in England, is for the mass of people the sole remaining heritage of Christian faith.

### IV

Is Christianity itself going down, after nineteen centuries of struggle to hold its authority as the religion in which humanity may find its ultimate reason for obedience and sacrifice, and its supreme comfort in a world of discomfort—this “vale of tears”? Even before the war there had been a steady growth of skepticism and revolt, less passionate, but more deadly than in the centuries of conflict between Protestantism and Catholicism, or the days of challenge between science and faith. That old warfare had quieted down. In intellectual circles there was a wider tolerance, on both sides. Science had yielded some of its “certainties” to faith. Religion, even inside the Catholic Church, had adopted some of the claims of science, admitting the possibility of evolution, though not accepting assertions of absolute proof, revising its geological dates, not standing rigidly to the literal interpretation of Old Testament stories. In many ways religion seemed to be regaining old ground, capturing new fields of missionary enterprise. The advance of Catholicism in England and the United States was remarkable in mere numbers, although it must be reckoned with the increase in population. But among Protestant denominations, and in nominally Catholic countries, like France and Italy, there had been a steady abandonment of religious fervor, a quite definite undermining of faith in Christian dogma by skeptical philosophy, reaching down to the humblest classes. It was not, as I have said, a fierce skepticism. It was stolid indifference. People could not be “bothered” with religious controversy. There had been too much of it. They had no ill will

## THE NEED OF THE SPIRIT

to folk who liked to go to church—any old church—but they preferred to stay away. Less and less to the middle classes and laboring classes did religion seem to have any real relationship with life and death. The parsons talked a lot of stuff which was obviously insincere. At any rate, they were all quarreling with one another as to what it really meant—flatly contradicting one another. In France and Italy the old Latin skepticism and cynicism was prevailing, even in the peasantry, and the young intellectuals of France, in spite of new movements among them, to make religion “good form” again, could not resist the genial incredulities of Anatole France, literary successor to Voltaire, Rabelais, and all the master skeptics of their literary heritage. The harsh and brutal realism of Zola and his school, their onslaught upon faith, had become old-fashioned. As in England, indifference rather than challenge was the new spirit. Even Catholic Frenchmen, or many of them, thought themselves among the faithful if they married in church, baptized their children, and received the last sacraments before death. Otherwise they did not trouble the church, though they doffed their hats to the village priest and thought him a very good fellow if he did not poke his nose into their private affairs.

The state of religious life before the war in France was rather stagnant, like this. Only in the universities and among the aristocracy was there an attempt, not altogether unsuccessful, to revive the Catholic spirit as part of the noble heritage of France, and to associate it with a patriotism which foresaw the new ordeal of war with Germany. The army chiefs, like Foch and Castelnau—the inner clique of the High Command—were Catholics of the old school, devout and firm in the faith that France was ordained by God to attain a new and spiritual victory over the



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

barbarians who were now called "Boches." The cult of Jeanne d'Arc became the fashion. On the other side the syndicalists and labor parties generally attacked the Church with contempt and scurrility as the great power of reaction, and France was ruled by politicians who had supported destruction of Church and state, and denounced Catholicism with ridicule and blasphemy.

In Prussia, the chosen kingdom of "the good old German God" as the Kaiser used to say, with an air of genial patronage, there had been a rapid decline in religious and spiritual standards, according to many competent observers, even of their own race. Ever since the victory of 1870 the Prussian people had become more and more arrogant, selfish, and materialistic. Their Protestantism had always been harsh in its character, without the kindness and sweet-tempered quality of our own denominations after the mellowing of the old Puritan austerities or the mild and sentimental spirit of the old German tradition in other parts of the Empire. But the Prussian character deteriorated when its Protestantism was abandoned for a gross materialism, a blatant and bullying atheism, with no more exalted faith than that of world empire under Prussian domination. I am not one of those who believe that every Prussian is possessed by seven devils, that by the very shape of his head he is outside the kinship of the European family, and that the mark of the beast is upon him. That seems to me an exaggeration convicting us of self-conceit, national self-complacency, and Phariseism closely approaching the very characteristics we are condemning. If the Prussian believed before the war that he was the noblest type of human being, and that the Empire he had founded had the close support of God, and that his destiny, his very duty, was to rule less civilized peoples, it must

## THE NEED OF THE SPIRIT

be admitted that there have been Englishmen with the same conceit of themselves. I have met them at club dinners, and have listened to their proclamation of such simple faith. But in Prussia, and perhaps to a less degree in other parts of Germany, this stirring of national confidence in a future of enormous conquest was supported by brutal qualities deliberately developed by education and public opinion, and as that educational influence deepened it created a degradation of morality. Spiritual values sank to a low level, and in their painting, their architecture, their drama, and their social amusements one saw a kind of morbid defiance of all that is gentle and refining in life. The word "stark" was a kind of spell upon them. Worse than that, though that was bad and enervating, a strain of degenerate vice attacked them. Without raking up the filth of war propaganda, it must be said that night life in Berlin, for instance, was worse than anything in cities like Paris or London (whose virtue was not unchallenged!), worse in coarseness and complete abandonment of any decent code. In the army the Prussian military caste was tainted with very abominable corruption. Prussia, in spite of many fair qualities and many good people, was governed by a spirit of evil. As far back as 1872 one old watcher of life, Cardinal Manning, saw the sowing of these weeds in the Prussian spirit, and in prophetic words foretold what now has happened:

The aberrations of a false philosophy—the inflation of false science—the pride of unbelief—and the contemptuous scorn of those who believe—are preparing Germany for an overthrow or for suicide.

All was not well with Christianity before the war. When war came it was in danger. Its own priests and ministers endangered it. Adopting the material watchwords, in England as well as in Germany, proclaiming

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

God and the justice of God to be on the side of their own battalions, in Germany as well as in England and France, in Austria as well as in Italy, they forgot that simple lads who had been to church or had at least heard the words "God is Love," or "Thou shalt not kill," or "Love one another," or "Forgive your enemies," asked themselves in dugouts and ditches whether there could be any divine authority for such commands when they were told, by the very men who preached them, not to love, but to hate; not to forgive, but to kill. They were quite certain they had to kill. That was obvious, disgusting though it was to most of them. Therefore what was the truth of a religion which said, "Thou shalt not kill"? Many of them after a time, by fear or by weariness or by some queer idealism, inarticulate, but becoming more clearly conscious and convincing as the war dragged on in what seemed interminable slaughter, came to criticize the whole meaning of the war, to thrust its guilt not only upon Germany, but upon the system of civilization which had made it possible, and the leaders of that civilization, and the teachers.

They worried out crude little syllogisms. "If Christianity is right, then war is wrong, or if war is right (or this war), then Christianity is a lie." And again: "Everything that I was taught not to do I am now taught to do, and ordered to do. That means that the whole moral code under which I was brought up was hypocrisy to keep me quiet. I was taught not to lie, but the newspapers and the politicians lie all the time, and make a virtue of it. I was taught to say my prayers to a good, kind, loving God Who would answer them. But when my pal Bill prayed that he might get through that raid for the sake of his wife and kids (I heard him when he thought I slept), a shell came and blew his blooming head off—and anyhow I don't see any signs of a good,

## THE NEED OF THE SPIRIT

kind, loving God. . . . Where is God, anyway, in this year 1914 (or 1917), and what proof is there of His interest in humanity? Or what proof is there of humanity's interest in *Him*? Christianity has been going a long time. Is this the result of it? It's all a queer mix-up. The Germans seem a pious crowd. Before every battle they pray and take the sacraments, just like some of us, only more so. Is God helping them or us? . . . . By God! the weather seems to favor 'em!"

Less crudely than that, but with higher perplexities, secret indignation of soul, other men, more cultured, questioned the truth of Christian faith, and could not reconcile it with the business in hand. Nor could they acquit its ministers of insincerity. They became skeptics even in the presence of death, or found some queer little shrine of faith of their own, some pagan creed of stoicism or fatalism, at which they worshiped, for comfort's sake.

Many of them were like that, as I have told in other writings. Many of them in spite of others who were glad of their chaplains, who became more fervent in religious duties, who became converts to Catholicism and then fell in battle like Christian martyrs to the beasts, who carved the sign of the Cross in the chalk of their dugouts—I have one of those chalk crosses now in a cabinet of relics—or, like the French at Vermelles, made a little altar to Notre Dame des Tranchées, and crowded round a soldier priest with bent heads, receiving from his earthy hands the body of Christ in the mystery of the Sacrament, with childlike faith, before they died. (Not one escaped in that part of the line.)

v

I will not dwell on what happened in war. I have written that. Here I would write of what happened

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

after the war and is now in action. There has been no spiritual revival. Christianity has not marched to new victories. It is still menaced with heavy losses, a general retreat all along the line of human society. Christian priests and pastors have not yet dispelled the doubt and darkness that came over the spirit of many men. Their authority and their faith are still challenged and a greater indifference than that before the war is in the minds of people toward the claims of Christian dogma.

The enormous turmoils of war loosened all the controls of character, upheaved old traditions of thought and conduct and belief. The enormous turmoil of peace loosened them still more, until they rattle. The brakes of the civilized world will not hold back the social machine as it speeds downhill.

The effect of peace was, at the time, like a sudden liberation of souls in bondage. The world breathed a deep sigh and then ran riot. I think now as I write of all the wild scenes I saw in Belgium and France and England during the celebration of the armistice and peace. They were not Christian in their general manifestation. It is true that the churches were thronged, that many prayers of thanksgiving were uttered, but in the streets of great cities and of small it was a Bacchanalia absolutely pagan. The women behaved like mænads and hamadryads, dancing, singing, giving themselves up to the joy of life which had been so long denied. Wild-eyed, ecstatic, with abandonment of all restraint, they went to the festivals of the streets to celebrate the return of the heroes. Youth had been reprieved. Old Man Death had been cheated of his last harvest of boys. Love had come back.

Love was unlicensed in the streets. Quick greetings, quick meetings, what mattered in the weeks of armis-

## THE NEED OF THE SPIRIT

tice? The soldiers of the Allies—English, French, Belgian, American, Italian—the prisoners of all the armies swarming through the lines again, the women who had waited for them, the girls who had been impatient of their coming, mingled in the crowds of joy and knew no law but that. Only those who were cold and old resisted the carnival. Only those who were sad and solitary with remembrance.

It was then that the dancing mania took possession of Europe. Even in Germany, defeated, despondent, still a little hungry, youth danced in the Bierhalle and Weinstube, as I saw them on the Rhine. Even in Vienna, where children starved and could not sit up with rickety limbs, there was dancing in the gilded restaurants. I made a tour in Europe through many cities and countries, and everywhere the music of jazz bands, the wild rhythm of them, throbbed in my ears to the beat of dancing feet.

I remember now one little picture among many others of that dancing time. It was on the *digue* at Zoute Knocke, close to Zeebrugge, where there was the hell of war and where still the wreckage of it lay about.

There were charming girls there of the best Belgian families, and English girls, and Americans, and Russians, and Poles, and Czecho-Slovaks, with young men who, I found, had been prisoners in Germany, or officers at Dixmude, or in a pleasant exile in England, during the war.

The orchestra for the dance was not magnificent. It was a simple piano-organ worked by the untiring arms of a humble philanthropist, not without reward. It played "Tipperary" and "The Broken Doll" unceasingly, to the rhythm of the fox-trot and the one-step.



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

The light from the café windows splashed across the roadway, making shadow pictures on the pavement of the dancers who came within its gleam, whose frocks and faces were touched by its glamour until they danced into the gloom beyond that range of radiance where there was night and the pale sea.

Outside the cafés sat the fathers and mothers of the dancers, smiling as they watched the swaying of young couples, the fantastic steps, the queer rhythmic kaleidoscope of that dance on the *digue*.

The wind was strong. It caught many a tress and blew it across the laughing face of a girl. It wafted off the hats of the boys and made their hair wild. Frocks were tossed into billows above long white stockings and long black stockings, and in and out of the grown-up dancers small children danced, wonderfully learned in the latest steps, like little marionettes.

Next to me sat a man who had factories at Ypres and Bailleul and Messines, where now there are only ashes and the rags and bones of buildings. Some of his girls were dancing there, and he smiled as he watched them pass, greeting him with their eyes, over the shoulders of their cavaliers.

"It is youth that dances on the edge of ruin," he said in French. "It is youth that dances to the tune of life."

Another picture comes to my mind—night in the Grande Place of Brussels with shadow pictures in the windows of the old guildhouses near the Hôtel de Ville and the Maison du Roi.

Here three centuries ago princes and princesses sat down to banquets in those mansions, and the old Place itself with its beauty of gilded pillars and sculptured stonework, still holding all the memory of the golden age in Flanders, was crowded with nobles and ladies and great merchants coming and going up the flights of steps,

## THE NEED OF THE SPIRIT

hollowed out now by the tread of many feet, which lead into the paneled rooms.

I heard music through open windows and went upstairs into one of those old rooms. It was thronged with young men and women of humble class, dancing together.

In the minstrel's gallery sat a company of large musicians playing large instruments loudly. To the blaring noise of it the Flemish dancers surged round, doing the fox-trot and the two-step. The boys danced in bowler hats and billycocks, and the ladies combed their hair between the dances. A negro in a black suit and felt hat came in with a big black box and opened it solemnly. I expected to see a magic carpet brought out, or some wizardry, but he sold lollipops to girls who tried to steal them. The boys banged the girls about good-naturedly in the Flemish style. The girls danced often with each other, with a wonderful knowledge of the latest steps. Now and then a boy and girl sat down heavily together on the boards, and there were shrieks of laughter. Two girls spoke to me in English. One of them showed me the portraits of her lovers. There were twenty of them, and all young English soldiers. She was sorry the war was over. . . . Another girl, waxen-faced, dark-eyed, ugly, kept telling me about a boy named Harry whom she had loved. They had lived together for a month, and when he went she wept her heart away.

A young Belgian soldier spoke to me and explained the spirit of the company.

"For five years there was war," he said; "now there is pleasure. We wish to make up for those five years. It is the same with everybody. We are forgetting the war and finding the pleasure of life." X

"Are there any who remember?" I asked.

He shrugged his shoulders. "The poor devils with



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

only one leg, or no legs, cannot dance. There are others who are blind. Some are rotten with disease. The lucky ones dance. It is our luck."

And everywhere in Europe the lucky ones danced.

### VI

Then gradually came disillusionment, disgust, except where youth refused to renounce its rights. For a year or more in some countries like England, for much less in others, governments and peoples maintained a fictitious show of prosperity, persuaded themselves that their debts did not exist, that their prosperity was assured, now that victory had come. In England the demobilized soldiers lived on doles and pensions, and the time of their withdrawal, when they must go to work again, was several times postponed. France was buoyed up by large promises of the fruits of victory, and, though prices soared to a fantastic height, wages rose, too, to most of them. I, and many others wiser than I, prophesied the coming of reality and was called a gloomy dog for such dark forebodings. But it came. Steadily reality bore down again the fiction of national arithmetic, international rivalry. Paper money would not buy real things. Real things must be made by hard work. Those who could not work must starve. Disease in one part of Europe would cause ill health in other parts, and Russia, Poland, Austria, were stricken with social ruin. Manufacturers would find production futile if they could find no markets to buy their goods. They could not longer pay high wages, or any wages, if markets were shut against them. Unemployment would grow apace if Europe did not set its house in order by reconciliation and free trade in peace. . . .

Those things happened in England, in many countries,

## THE NEED OF THE SPIRIT

even in the United States of America, untouched, as they believed, by European conditions. And as they happened, the psychology of peoples was affected by bitterness and ill will and suspicion and anger. Where were all the fine promises made to them in war? "A land fit for heroes to live in!" That was the promise to British soldiers. "The fruits of victory!" had been the promise to the peoples of France. Instead, taxation bore down with crushing burdens. Poverty showed its ugly head, men who had been heroes in the war broke their hearts against the hardness of this peace.

Even that was insecure. Wars and rumors of war shook the ground of eastern Europe and of Asia with *tremblements de terre* that caused uneasiness and alarm on our side of the Continent. The future, for boys old enough to rejoice at peace, was covered with a black pall. The great conflict had been called "a war to end war." This peace looked like a peace to end peace. By old stupidities or new devilries, the statesmen of Europe seemed to have made a hopeless mess of victory. The peoples looked for new leaders who did not come. Under the tightening pressure of war burdens and peace failures, they became hard, cynical, selfish. It was a fight now, not for high ideals, but for wages that would not be below the 1914 standard of living, reckoned in actual values. It was no longer to be a search for a new world, but a struggle for existence. Not idealism, but materialism, was the gospel of many who for a time had been generous in sacrifice, splendidly forgetful of self. In that state of selfishness are we now, as I write this book.

Yet, by a strange and tragic contradiction, there has been no time in modern history when the peoples of the old civilization have been so desperately eager for spiritual guidance. There is a great thirst for spiritual

ambitions, to a cleansing of heart  
of Commons, that assembly of  
look as if they had done extremely  
out of that House of Worldly V  
for "a spiritual lead."

In the Middle Ages western Europe  
which sent the common man in his hu  
to the Crusades; which enshrined itse  
cathedrals, abbeys, churches; which p  
philosophy and art, great epic poems,  
expressed itself in a theory of govern  
Roman Empire and Holy Catholic Ch  
likewise in the lives of great men and in t  
sainthood of St. Francis, the statesman  
ideal, like all the ideals by which the gr  
long past of our race have been fashioned  
possess no common ideal. We thrill wi  
tremble at no common terror. The natio  
one from another, and the classes within  
fallen asunder. The respect for real s  
along with that for the traditional superi  
recognized sanction. We are all one as  
ostentation replaces true distinction.  
meaningless. . . . The world of our day  
Francis who shall call it to a new knowle  
have to go far for his message. It is no  
beyond the sea. "but the word is very nic

## THE NEED OF THE SPIRIT

So wrote from the smoking room of the House of Commons—reeking with cynicism and haunted by the betrayal of all ideals—Sir Martin Conway, M.P., to the office of the *Times*.

“We thrill with no common hope,” he said; “we tremble at no common terror.” He is right in thinking so, in so far as nations are still divided and peoples are unable to link up their hopes and their terror in one united faith and action. Yet I see beneath the Europe of our present state the same hopes and the same terror stirring among all people, and out of them will come, I believe, the salvation of civilization, if it is to be saved. Even this materialism of which I have been writing is largely the bitterness of peoples whose ideals have been frustrated but not killed, and who grab at petty, selfish things because they seem the way to larger hopes. A good deal of the social unrest, the spirit of revolt among us, the violence of revolution, is due to “common hopes” and “common terror,” working crudely in many minds in many nations. The terror is the fear of new and devastating wars thrust upon the peoples by evil statesmanship or created by their own passions. To avoid that terror, the spirit of democracy is running about like a rat in a trap, wild-eyed, fierce with fear. It was not the love of militarism, but the fear of another war, which caused the French people to demand ruthless sanctions against the Germans, to support the Polish alliance, to flame with anger against the English who spoke of fair play even to Germany. And it was not a different motive, but the same, which led the English democrats to protest against too harsh a treatment of Germany, because they believed that only by reconciliation and generosity to the beaten enemy, whose strength would one day be great again, could Europe, and France herself, be saved from another orgy of massacre. The dangerous philosophy of revolutionary labor, the wild

another, a closer brotherhood of r  
law, the security of the individ  
from degrading poverty, the aboli  
class and class by greater equality  
the raising of the general stand  
men and women shall have a fai  
and joy. These are the ideals a  
of England, France, Italy, Germa  
States. They are good ideals.  
by Pope and priests and pastors.  
ideals of society set out in the Gos  
we have all been struggling throu  
They are now astir, passionately,  
mean streets, in peasants' hovels,  
lutionary committees, in Red arr  
ing societies, in the private apar  
Rome. Most of the troubles of .  
to the desperate efforts of people  
In their human blindness and fo  
attain the ideal good. English w  
in other countries, think that b  
they can maintain their wages 1  
standard of living, whereas they  
source of wealth. The commu

## THE NEED OF THE SPIRIT

against all governments, thereby leading to appalling atrocities and to incessant bloodshed. The failure of European statesmen to create a new world out of the ruins of the old, and the power of reactionary leaders to crush the hopes of the idealists looking forward to a reconstruction of society with less inequality between those who work and those who profit, have poisoned the brains of many people not otherwise evil. Indignation against "profiteers," a sense of injustice, an impatience with old ways of political argument and with old calls to loyalty and obedience from men who gained most and suffered least when their calls were answered, are seething in the caldron of mass psychology. Yet the "common hopes," masked by materialism, expressed in violence, are in their essence the general aspiration of humanity toward a higher phase of social life. Here is a great power of idealism, which some new leader might call upon for immense service. Cleansed from its grossness, lifted above selfishness, spiritualized, it might now very quickly reform the world and lead us forward to new conquests of civilization.

### VII

I have said that the ideals of the time are the same in the antechambers of the Pope as in the thatched cot of the peasant. That sounds like an affected phrase, yet not long after the war it was in the Pope's own room, and from the Pope himself, that I heard the proof of that. Looking back upon that interview I had with him in the Vatican, I am astonished at the temerity with which I asked for it and the rapidity with which it was granted, for it was against all precedents and contrary to the austere etiquette and privacy which surround the Vatican. It was not merely the desire for a newspaper "scoop," the vulgarity of which I loathe,

might rise above the conflict and  
or perhaps in a voice of penetra  
world back to sanity and Christ  
did not happen. Sorrowful me:  
deploring the "fratricidal strife"  
himself as mediator and peacen  
came to stir the hearts of people  
irresistible in appeal or comm  
thought him pro-German. In C  
him pro-Ally. The world igno:  
priests were with the world. B  
say something worth hearing b  
leadership. Through the *Daily*  
and the *Times* of New York I  
read by millions of plain folk-  
who were looking for a spiritu  
simply and truly was why I as  
Pope.

My intermediary was a certa  
well known in the United States  
he had learned to speak English  
accent and breezy unconvention:  
encouraged audacity. He laugh  
told him of my desire. "I

## THE NEED OF THE SPIRIT

"Of course there is no chance?" He smiled and said, "I will let you know."

Of course there was no chance, and I put the idea out of my head until at the Hotel Bristol I received a card permitting me to be received in private audience by *Sa Sainteté* for twenty minutes, at noon on the following day. The impossible had happened!

It was of course a great honor—President Wilson himself had been granted this same time limit—and to me a great adventure. I remember now my nervousness, as I put on evening dress on the morning of the interview—according to etiquette—and wrecked a white tie so miserably that I had to borrow a waiter's, and made a hopeless botch of it. So through the golden sunlight of an October day in Rome, in the year 1919, I drove in an old *carozza* to the Vatican. I felt like a man with a great mission. I was going to get a message which might help the sick old world a little. As the great dome of St. Peter's came into view, with the wide-embracing sweep of its colonnades—those mighty columns on each side of the cathedral square—I thought of the great popes who had raised the magnificence of this shrine and whose acts had made Rome the headquarters of Christendom through every age. Some of them had been evil men, weak men, but many were strong, with a burning passion in them which had lighted new fires of faith, active in charity, unyielding in their assertion of authority, immensely powerful, not only by virtue of their office, but by force of character, splendor of justice, love of humanity, sainthood. The world needed such leadership now.

In the white entrance hall of the Vatican, to the right of St. Peter's, I was saluted by the halberdiers in their striped tunics and hose, passed up a long flight of marble steps, walked through many antechambers in which stood groups of papal guards, and in a smaller room



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

was greeted by a chamberlain who knew my business. Five minutes passed, which seemed longer than ten. A door opened and a monk came out with a smile about his lips as though satisfied with words spoken to him. The chamberlain beckoned me. At the doorway stood Benedict XV.

He was a simple figure, dressed in white, not so tall as I had expected—a tiny man—and with a scholar's look, a little austere at first glance. Only at a glance, for, after my first salute and when I asked him for permission to speak in French, he laughed in a genial way, and said, in French also, "In that language we shall understand each other."

Then he took me by the hand and led me to a chair close to his own, so that we sat side by side.

He asked me about America first, having heard that I had been there not long ago, and then asked me to tell him about the little studies I have been making of the conditions of Europe after the war.

I spoke to him about the distress of peoples burdened by high prices and heavy taxation, and about the curious and rather dangerous psychology of many people in England, France, Belgium, and Germany—probably in Italy also—who are in revolt against present conditions, and are disillusioned about that "new world" which they expected after the war.

The Pope listened attentively, and then cut me short, as I had hoped.

"Yes," he said, "the war was a scourge"—he used that word "*fléau*" several times in his conversation—"and the effects of it are enormous and incalculable. When it began people imagined that it would be a quick war, lasting three, four, five months. Few guessed that it would last for nearly five years. That long period of strife—that terrific scourge—will have far-reaching and enduring results. The people must make up their



## THE NEED OF THE SPIRIT

minds to endure the consequence of war. *They must steel themselves to suffer.* At the same time we must do everything in our power to alleviate those sufferings and to ease the burdens of those who can least afford to support them."

I noticed that throughout our conversation the Pope's thoughts seemed to be concentrated mostly upon the conditions of the working classes. He spoke of the people rather than of their rulers, and of the poor rather than of the rich.

When, for instance, I referred again to the strikes and other symptoms of social unrest in many countries, he said:

"The people have been irritated by a sense of injustice. . . . There are many men who have made money out of this war."

He made a gesture with his forefinger and thumb, as though touching money, and said:

"Those who grew rich out of the war will have to pay. The burden of taxation will, no doubt, fall heavily upon them."

He spoke of the great difficulty of the financial situation in all countries which have been at war. He seemed to think there was no easy or quick solution of those economic problems, nor any immediate prospect of bringing down high prices to a normal level.

"It is difficult," he said, "difficult."

I was interested when he referred to the question of the forced loan in Italy. That was a project by which a levy was to be made on all capital in Italy, starting at 5 per cent on all fortunes above £800 and going up to 40 per cent on the largest fortunes.

The Pope did not express any definite opinion upon this measure, but said, "Undoubtedly such taxation as that would lay a heavy burden upon the whole nation."

with all the suffering, but it did  
poor people—wives and mothers,  
—and mitigated some of the  
acts.”

He mentioned briefly some o  
been achieved under his direction  
detailed list of charitable service  
by the Holy See.

Among those works which  
mentioned were the exchange o  
capacitated for military service,  
dated December 31, 1914, to the  
of belligerent states, and the libe  
civilian prisoners.

These proposals were accepted  
prisoners through Switzerland  
that between March, 1915, and  
Germans and 8,868 Frenchmen  
countries, while in a single month  
passed from occupied regions to se

Then the Pope mentioned to m  
his direction for endeavoring to  
abouts of missing men. Soon

## THE NEED OF THE SPIRIT

1914 he instituted a special bureau, with branches afterward at Paderborn, Freiburg, and Vienna.

"In many cases," said the Pope, "we were able to give news to poor anxious families, but of course in many other cases there was disappointment."

Over 100,000 letters were sent to the families of Italian soldiers who were captured or missing.

He also mentioned the work done after his prolonged negotiations with the Powers to secure a refuge in Switzerland for the sick and wounded, and especially for consumptives.

"We used our influence," he said, "whenever possible, to commute the death penalty of people condemned by military law in Austria and Germany. In a number of cases this was successful."

It was owing to the Pope's intervention that over a hundred French hostages from Roubaix were liberated, and among many other people, Princess Marie de Croy (the friend of Nurse Cavell), who was condemned to ten years' penal servitude for having concealed French and Belgian soldiers, owed the mitigation of her punishment and other concessions to the Pope's intercession. It was impossible for him to act in the case of Nurse Cavell, owing to the rapidity and secrecy of her execution.

The Pope made only a passing allusion to these services, and said again: "It was very little. We did all that was possible, but it only touched the great anguish of the war."

He told me where I could get detailed accounts of the enormous sums of money sent by the Holy See to Belgium, Poland, Montenegro, and other countries, for the purpose of feeding starving populations, and of his repeated protests against the brutalities of war by whomsoever they might be committed, and of his three appeals for peace, the last of which, dated August 1,

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

1917, contained concrete proposals for the beginning of negotiations, very similar to President Wilson's "Fourteen Points" which came later.

I tried to induce the Pope to continue upon that line of conversation, but he came back suddenly to the conditions prevailing after the war, and expressed the hope that the disillusionment of peoples, the inevitable rise in prices owing to taxation, and financial distress, would not lead to violence or anarchy.

"It is the duty of all men," he said, "to endeavor to solve these social problems in a lawful and peaceable way and so that the burden will be fairly shared with good will and charity."

Speaking about the relations between capital and labor, he referred several times to the writings or "Encyclicals" of Leo XIII upon those subjects, which, he said, expressed very clearly and in great detail the Christian principles regarding the rights of workingmen and of employers, as well as the duties of the state. He hoped those writings by Leo XIII might be popularized, as they bore directly upon the problems of modern social conditions.

"All their teaching," he said, "may be summed up in two words—Justice and Charity. If men behave justly and with real Christian charity toward one another, many of the troubles of the world will be removed. But without justice and charity there will be no social progress."

After a few more remarks on general subjects, in which he showed his desire for the welfare of the people and for an alleviation of the sufferings which now prevail in so many countries as a direct consequence of the war, the Pope rose from his chair and the audience ended, after exactly twenty minutes, with his direct permission to me to publish the general course of this conversation.

The words he had spoken were not sensational. To



## THE NEED OF THE SPIRIT

be quite truthful, I was disappointed with them. There was nothing in what he had said which would call to the hearts of peoples with trumpet notes, no great cry of pity and appeal, no passion of spiritual leadership. Here was a little, scholarly man, using no high-flown phrases, but talking with keen common sense, sincere interest in the problems of democracy, sadness at the tragedy of the world. Most people would see nothing but platitudes in what he told me. Yet, after all, as I reflected, when I went out again into the sun-swept square of St. Peter's, they were platitudes based upon the authority of old and wise tradition, and upon a faith in Christ, and such words spoken by a pope or by a peasant might fall strangely upon the ears of a world deafened by loud and hostile cries, after a war in which such a phrase as "Christian charity" was mocked by hatred and cruelty. After this interview I wrote a sentence which now I read and write again: "Those two words, now, at this present day, in this Europe which I see so full of suffering, revolt, and passion, hold perhaps the truth toward which mankind is groping desperately in all manner of ways, with divers philosophies. They overturned the pagan world when Peter came to Rome, and still have power."

### VIII

Perhaps Christianity is passing beyond the faith of men who have no longer the simplicity of mind to believe its mysteries. We must face that question. If so, is there any new religion likely to arise and command the allegiance of the world with an authority which they acknowledge as divine? For if not, it is certain that there will be no rally up from the spiritual degradation into which we have fallen, but still further a lowering of moral standards, a grosser materialism.

disillusion and despair, and  
some compensating life beyond  
span will seem but mockery as  
the past to thoughtful souls,  
credit side of life's account.

There are some who believe  
humanity will reach greater heights  
a nobler code of moral law.  
for the philosophers of the past  
claimed great stores of happiness  
rich in knowledge. Nor has Europe  
virtue, as far as we may grasp the  
best culture. Germany was, the  
educated nation in Europe, but  
they were not most virtuous.  
In Italy of the Renaissance the  
great humorists, lovers of beauty,  
curb on passion, nor did all their  
The code of virtue is hard to come  
dom of passion. It is pain to  
the spirit, except among rare  
way through life. Nor will any  
morality help human nature to  
of pain. From "The



## THE NEED OF THE SPIRIT

hardships and its agonies, and as we know, if the past means anything to the present, the lack of law, the denial of spiritual duties, ordained by a God believed and feared by men, ends in bestiality and blood lust. For the heart of man is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked.

It must be the old faith, or a new faith, with divine authority, stronger over the minds of men than man-made law. That is acknowledged, subconsciously, by all people to-day. Those who have abandoned the old faith are not satisfied with atheism or agnosticism. Secretly they grope about for some other God, or Devil. There is an immense amount of this secret groping, this reaching out to a spirit world by means of incantations, spells, and wizardries. It is a bad sign. It was done in Rome before the downfall, in London at its lowest phase, between the Middle Ages and Modernity, when foul old James was king and Kerr with his witch-wife was favorite in Paris before the Revolution. No new faith to lead humanity forward seems likely to come from spirit-rappings, table-turnings, planchettes, and all the incoherent revelations of the subconscious mind exhibited in the "spirit-writings" of Vale Owen and his kind, which have deluded so many simple minds craving for spiritual guidance, for communion with their dead, for certainty in future life.

It has, perhaps, only one redeeming quality, and that is the proof that human beings need some high sanction for their way of life, and reach out to a spiritual law as their one hope of comfort.

All this stirring and strife of the world means that. All this social unrest is but the search for the ideal happiness. And everywhere, in all classes and all nations, there are numbers of men and women filled with a passion for service, ready for self-sacrifice, desperately eager for spiritual leadership which will give the world



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

greater peace, and the peoples of the world a better chance of happiness in their souls and in their lives. There is an amount of good will in the world to-day which would recreate all social life, if but a leader came to guide it and unite it with a common impulse. I do not think that leader will come, not in the old way, singly, in sainthood, with some message of all-embracing love. I think rather it will be by the closing up of all these separated impulses among the plain folk, by a sudden unity of purpose before a common peril threatening them all, and by the combined leadership of many minds, still young and unformed, in our midst, gathering up all these ideals and emotions and hopes and giving form to them, and order.

The common peril is the decay of civilization by a lowering of the standards of living, due to the breakdown of economic machinery which turned the wheels of our old life, and the menace of another devastating war which would stop them altogether. The peoples are conscious of that peril. Instinctively, at least, they are aware of it. I believe that suddenly, when it assumes a more terrifying aspect, they will gather together in a great and common crusade to avert its horrors. All the myriad impulses of good will which I find everywhere in the world beneath the hard crust of national egotism, will flow in a broad, steady river of spiritual purpose, and perhaps the old lamps of Christian faith will be relit.

There is, I fancy, a troubled conscience among some of the ministers of the Christian churches, a sense of guilt and of fear. In the universal tragedy of the war they were rebuked by the pettiness of their sectarian quarrels, their utter loss of touch with the souls of men, condemned to die because their teaching had failed. Now, after the war, they are troubled because in that time they were impotent, divided into nationalities



## THE NEED OF THE SPIRIT

like the warring nations, and into defenders of the state (right or wrong), instead of being united as defenders of the Faith. Surely, as they knew, religion must be more universal than that of Juju men of the war-painted tribes. In the *Hibbert Journal* at which I glance from time to time as an adventure in psychology, there have been great outpourings of heart, confessions of failure, pleas for unity, programs for bringing the Christian churches into closer touch with the people. They seem to believe they have their chance now, once more, to restore the old faith to the people, and their last chance. I believe that the Protestant churches will make a desperate bid for that by identifying themselves with the economic interests of democracy and supporting them in all demands that are clear in justice. This new attempt was seen very clearly in the great British coal strike in the spring of this year, when a group of bishops of the Anglican Church supported the case of the miners and affirmed in the spirit of Pope Leo XIII that the first charge on industry should be the wages of labor sufficient for the decent livelihood of the workers. That was a sign of a new spirit in the Church of England which did not excite more than a passing comment, yet it was remarkable from a body of men who by their tradition of caste and training, since the alliance between state and Church, have been aristocratic in their intellectual outlook, stubborn opponents of democratic progress, and, with a few notable exceptions, stanch defenders of the power and privilege of wealth, however unjust in its oppression. Even now the clergy of England as a body, apart from many zealous missionaries among the poor of the cities, stand for the old order and not for the new, for the squirearchy and not for the peasantry, for aristocracy of rank and money against the rising claims of the great crowd. They do so without corrupt intentions or conscious snobbery,

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

being for the most part men of amiable character and devoted service, abominably poor themselves in the small parishes, but it is their intellectual heritage.

There is one among them who is an intellectual champion of the old order, a very dangerous enemy of democracy whose very name he loathes as a foul, ill-flavored word. This is Dean Inge, one of the most remarkable figures in English life to-day—"the gloomy Dean," as he is called in the popular press. A melancholy man, profoundly interested in all the facts of life, able to relate them to the experience of history throughout the ages, he has an angry, irritable contempt for the shabby ignorance, the loose thinking, the lyings, shams, and insincerities of politicians and pressmen. With a gloomy vision, justified, alas, in its gloom, he regards the moral slackness of the masses and the economic misery of Europe without sentiment, and in a hard, realistic spirit. He is contemptuous of the little expedients of humanists and intellectuals to cure the evils of our state. He sees strong tides and currents of social evolution sweeping all such efforts like straws before them. He watches the checks and balances of nature, controlling the destiny of men. He sees man himself as a puppet of blind forces buffeted about, broken, without power over his own direction. Disease, famine, wars, the ebb and flow of trade, the struggle of races, the rise and fall of empires, the progress and retrogression of human society, are the themes with which he deals with a sense of mastery and with a kind of savage joy in revealing the impotence and absurdity of human endeavor. His arguments have brought him to the conclusion that the white races will go down before the dark races unless they revert to dirt-cheap labor, abandon all social progress for the masses, and raise greater armies than before to maintain their heritage—even then being bound to lose in course of time

## THE NEED OF THE SPIRIT

when the dark races will also arm and advance to destroy.

Testimonies [he wrote] which might easily be multiplied, and which are not contradicted, are sufficient to prove that under a regime of peace, free trade, and unrestricted migration the colored races would outwork, underlive, and eventually exterminate the whites. The importance of this fact cannot be exaggerated. The result of the European, American, and Australian labor movement has been to produce a type of workingman who has no survival value, and who but for protection in its extremest form, the prohibition of immigration, would soon be swept out of existence. And this protection rests entirely on armed force; in the last resort, on war. It is useless to turn away from the facts, however unwelcome they may be to our socialists and pacifists. The abolition of war and the establishment of a league to secure justice and equality of treatment for all nations, would seal the doom of the white laborer, such as he has made himself. There was a time when we went to war to compel the Chinese to trade with us, and when we ruined a flourishing Indian trade by the competition of Lancaster cotton. That was the period which it is the fashion to decry as a period of ruthless greed and exploitation. The workingman has brought that period to an end. To-day he is dreaming of fresh rewards, doles, and privileges which are to make the white countries a paradise for his class. And all the time he is living on sufferance, behind an artificial dike of ironclads and bayonets, on the other side of which is a mass of far more efficient labor, which would swallow him up in a generation if the barriers were removed.

In his philosophical writings Dean Inge strives to be unbiased, scientific in his search for truth, but throughout them all he reveals himself as the protagonist of aristocracy and the enemy of the mob, a believer in slave labor, well disciplined, kept tame, subservient to authority by force and moral obedience. He belongs to the school of thought which in the early nineteenth century defended the use of child labor in factories for fourteen hours a day, fought step by step against all the Factory Acts which gave the workers a chance of decency and health, and opposed the trade union which helped to gain those victories as the work of the



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

devil. The clergy of the Church of England, especially those in comfortable livings, belonged to that school of thought, and betrayed the Gospel of Christ by their toadyism to the cruelest company of industrial slave drivers that have ever escaped hanging by outraged humanity. It was their callousness to the sufferings of the people that divorced the Church of England from the masses. If Dean Inge prevails over his brethren, the Church of England will disappear under a wave of wrath. But he is a lonely man these days.

Everywhere, in all classes and in all nations, the spirit of the people is rising, claiming new rewards, a bigger share of life's good gifts, and seeking some way of escape from the eternal menace of war, the crushing burdens of armaments, the idiocy of international strife. Everywhere the spirit of good will is gathering strength to fight the spirit of ill will, to obtain union over disunion, and construction instead of destruction. Even Dean Inge ought to see that if the peril of the dark races is real, the only answer is the unity of the white races, rather than endless rivalry with bouts of massacre. The people begin to see that. They demand leadership to that end. They will produce their own leaders. It is the hope of Europe.

## IV

### THE NEW GERMANY

#### I

**D**URING the war the German people were put outside the pale of civilization by the Allied propagandists and by public opinion, fever-heated not only by those engineers of passion (enormously efficient), but by their own nightmares of imagination and ferocity. The French called them "Boches" and "Barbares," the British called them "Huns," and the readers of the *Daily Mail* and other popular journals believed firmly, and here and there continue to believe, that "German" means the same thing as "Devil," and that German human nature is in none of its characteristics similar to the nature of the rest of the human family, but a thing apart—obscene, monstrously cruel, abominable.

Most of these characteristics were recorded, in millions of words, within the first six weeks of war, and became fixed for all the war, and for years to come, in millions of minds. The invasion of Belgium was the first shock under which the imagination of people who knew nothing of modern warfare (none of us knew) reeled and saw red. Then followed atrocity stories—the cutting off of babies' hands and women's breasts, the shooting of civilians, the burnings in Alost and Louvain, abominable outrages on women and children. These things, told day after day by correspondents, repeated with whispered words of horror in every house

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

in France and England, reiterated and confirmed (it seemed) by the Bryce Report—created a hatred of the German race too deep for words, in masses of simple hearts. Those people were surely devilish! Not Attila and his Huns had done worse things in the dawn of history. They were human gorillas, monsters. The removal of the women of Lille and other towns for enforced labor away from their own folks aroused the fury to flaming heights again. The use of poison gas, their treatment of prisoners, and, later, the sinking of merchant ships and the *Lusitania* and Red Cross ships in an unrestricted U-boat warfare, gave fresh food to those greedy for the continuity of Hate. The Germans from first to last were “Huns” of inhuman wickedness. So many wrote, and so most of those who read believed.

I was not one of those who wrote or believed as much as that. Never once throughout the whole war did I call the Germans “Huns,” never once, from first to last, did I in my thoughts or in my words credit those who put them outside the human family. I believed always, with what seems to me now a strange obstinacy, though I have not altered my belief, that the Germans as a people were neither better nor worse than others in Europe, though under the discipline of powers a little more evil and cruel, and ruthless in cruelty, than other powers dominating the actions of common men. I have called this conviction of mine a “strange obstinacy” because, looking back on it, I marvel that I withstood the tremendous pressure of public opinion and of German guilt. I had no blood ties or other bonds with the German folk. Before the war I had only spent a few weeks in their country. My affection was wholeheartedly for the French, and during the war this developed into a deep enthusiasm. I was not a pacifist in the sense of a man afraid to fight, or a “conscientious objector” against fighting, for as a correspondent all

## THE NEW GERMANY

my soul was with the fighting men, and I risked my life with them. Nor could any soul alive have been more sickened by those tales of horror, and by cruelty undenied and undeniable. I was there to see the manner of German destruction, day by day, year by year, in ruined cities and ravaged fields, and all their killing of young manhood. Yet never did I believe in their monstrosity, or their place apart in the human family, as ogre changelings. I think what was always at the back of my mind was the belief that the German people, as a whole, the peasants and the clerks and the manufacturing fellows, were but victims of a damnable discipline and of a still more damnable philosophy, imposed upon them by military minds of a rigid and almost religious caste; and that those Prussian Junkers were only rather more logical, and very much more efficient, in the fulfillment of their ideas than certain English militarists whom I had happened to meet along the way of life—an opinion in which I have since been confirmed by certain generals in Ireland and others like them in cerebral structure of anthropoid type.

Again and again I met German prisoners, captured freshly on the field of battle, talked with them, watched them, and read their letters, which I used to grab from dugouts. They were human fellows, all right. They hated the war and called it the "Great Swindle" years before it ended, and cursed their officers. They were afraid, like our men, under barrage fire. They were mostly very civil, and glad of a civil word to them. They loved their wives and children, like most human animals (a little more than most, perhaps), though doubtless they were unfaithful behind the lines in France, being men in exile, and eager for what life could give them before death came. In physique masses of them were extraordinarily like English fellows of country regiments. There was not a bean to choose between



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

them. Doubtless some of them got beastly drunk when there was a chance, like some of ours, and men who are beastly drunk do beastly things.

Yes, but atrocities? . . .

Well, they had shot down civilians in cold blood, or in hot blood, and called them, justly or unjustly, *francs-tireurs*. Shots had come from Belgian windows, so they said. They had burned Belgian homes and put Belgian men and boys against a wall and killed them. Horrible!—but defended in my hearing by British officers, who said: "We should do the same. It's the law of war." Doubtless there had been many atrocities, but I could never get evidence of any of them. All the evidence I could get myself, throughout the war, in the places where they were alleged to happen, was against the truth of them. No living babies had their hands cut off, nor women their breasts. That is certain, in spite of faked photographs. No Canadians were crucified, though it will be believed in Canada for all time. The evidence was analyzed and rejected by our G. H. Q. There were no German "corpse factories," though our Chief of Intelligence patronized the myth. I myself inquired for atrocities in Lille, Liège, and captured villages in which we rescued civilians who had lived for years in Germans hands. I could not get any evidence at all. The civilians themselves, while cursing the Germans as a "*sale race*," did not charge them with abominable acts resembling in any way the atrocity stories of the newspapers. I am convinced that much of the evidence in the Bryce Report is utterly untrustworthy. Nevertheless, there were, no doubt, atrocities, horrible and disgusting cruelties, on evidence that cannot be lightly disregarded, and according to the nature of men—peasants, drunken fellows, degenerate brutes, living in an enemy country in time of war. We have seen in Ireland the cruelty of human passion on both

## THE NEW GERMANY

sides. There were bad things done by German soldiers, and there were worse things done by the orders of the German High Command. That business of the women in Lille was unpardonable. The sinking of hospital ships was a degradation of humanity itself. The smashing of French machinery in cotton mills and silk industries revealed an evil genius corresponding to the destruction of Irish creameries condoned by Hamar Greenwood and providing amusement to Lloyd George.

The use of poison gas aroused an outcry from civilized peoples—among the Allies. Our own intensive use of it rather dulled the sensibilities of public opinion, and our recent experiments in a more deadly form of gas (highly successful) show that our military minds intend to use it in the next war, should military minds still be allowed to have their way. Yet the charge sheet remains heavy against the Germans in the war, nor were the people themselves guiltless in supporting acts then which now, in defeat, they condemn. Not guiltless, callous of much cruelty, so that they might get victory. Well, we find more cruelty in human nature, outside Germany, than once we cared to believe. In Russia it is not unknown, though Russians were so good and kind when they were still fighting on our side. Even in England, and in Ireland, there are potentialities of cruelty which are not quite reassuring to our self-complacency, though, on the whole, we are a kindly and good-natured folk, unless we have swerved from the straight line of tradition. The more I see of different peoples, up and down the world, the more I understand that they cannot be held guilty for the acts of their rulers, for the policy of their diplomats, for the cruelty of their fellows, or for their own ignorance and stupidity. There is no "England" when foreign folk say "England" does this or does that, thinks this or that. There are millions of English people who do and

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

think quite differently, or have no share in what is done or thought in particular cases. There is no "France" when we say "France" is hostile to England, "France" wants to establish a military autocracy in Europe. There are many French people who love England still, many who are antimilitary. So the German housewife, watching her children develop bulbous heads with rickets (what they call "the English disease") because of our blockade, had very little to do, as far as I can see, with the gas attack at Ypres, and the peasant hustled from his plow to front-line trenches was not responsible directly for Von Tirpitz and the U-boat war. "But they supported their government," says the logical man. "They did not rise and overthrow their devilish leaders." That is true. But English folk decline to be branded because their government has done things which they detest, villanious things, without honor, dirty things which cannot bear the light of day. The clerks, the shop girls, the farmers' boys, the mechanics, have not overthrown a government which is the most sinister combination of corrupt interests ever known in English history. They have neither the power, nor the knowledge, to control or check or defy their government. Most of them are too busy with their little needs of life to bother about it.

### II

The claim of the Germans to an ordinary share of human characteristics was admitted by most of our fighting men throughout the war, who called the man on the opposite side of the way "Fritz" or "Jerry," with a certain sympathy, as being in the same bloody mess, and with real admiration as a first-class fighting man. The claim was also admitted, instantly and astoundingly, by the British troops who occupied the

## THE NEW GERMANY

Rhine bridgeheads after the armistice. The Germans showed no kind of hostility against our men. On the contrary, there was something rather humiliating at first in their show of friendliness. They went too far, it seemed to some of us, in playing English patriotic airs in their public restaurants, so soon after their defeat. Fear, perhaps, as well as a desire to be *gemüthlich*, was the secret motive of their friendliness. If British soldiers had been ugly tempered, they could have made a hell along the Rhine. Better to keep them good tempered!

All motives apart, there was quickly on the Rhine a "cordial understanding" between our men and German families in whose houses they were billeted. Whether we like to admit it or not, there is something German in our own blood, in our way of life, in our manner of speech. The houses were spotlessly clean, and our Tommies liked this cleanliness. When taps were turned on, water came out, and our men, after experience in French billets, where sanitary engineering is not a strong science, said, "Bloody wonderful!" Afterward some of them, under the tuition of some *Deutsches-Mädchen*, said, "*Merkwürdig!*" There German girls were neat and clean and fair and plump, like buxom-country wenches at home. They were good interpreters of German life to British lads.

Our officers yielded more tardily, with certain prickings of conscience, and with a stirring of old memories and oaths of hatred, to German civility, until most of those, too, were captured with admiration for the good order of German social life, for their astonishing industry and efficiency, for the solid comfort of their homes, and for their habitual sense of discipline. There were certain types of German manhood who remained repulsive to English eyes and ideas—the bald-headed vulture type—but so quickly, so utterly, did all sense

... and listened to German  
"Roast Beef of Old England"  
the Waves." It was just a  
people, anyhow, were human  
guilty of atrocities, not "Hun  
ideas, not particularly respon  
jolly glad, like our people, tha

To me it seemed a great m  
I saw it as a hope that, after all  
stronger than international  
wrong, at the time, for interna  
itself, mostly on our side, and  
in contact with one another cou  
tilities and greeds and plunder  
peoples not in human contact  
Justice, also, had to be consi  
Roland apostrophized liberty fro  
we cry out, "*Comme on t'a jou*  
games they have played in thy

### III

The German people acknow  
mere newspaper myth which :

## THE NEW GERMANY

doom to any last vestige of incredulity. The German Empire had surrendered its armies, its fleet, its mercantile marine, its property in many countries, and was pledged for years, and generations, to pay such great sums of money in indemnities to the victor nations that no imagination could grasp their significance beyond the certain fact that German industry would be taxed to the utmost limit under the pressure of irresistible force. Every soldier who tore off his shoulder straps and went back home told the tale of the last months of war, when there were no reliefs, no reinforcements, no chance of holding the front against the enemy attacks, so that they were rounded up like sheep after ghastly slaughter. It is true that men like Ludendorff and other generals tried to fling the blame of defeat on the civilian populations, wrote about "the stab in the back," blamed the revolution for the breakdown of the armies. That cowardly camouflage has not deceived the German people, though newspaper correspondents accept it on its face value.

"You have gambled. You have lost. You must pay!" said a Socialist Deputy in the Reichstag when I was in Berlin this summer, and he turned to the members of the Right—representatives of the Junkers—who tried to mock at him, but then were silent under that lash of truth.

They knew they were defeated, the German people, in their bodies and in their souls.

In their bodies they knew long before the ending of the war. We do not yet realize—those, at least, who were not in Germany at once after the armistice—how sharp was the tooth of hunger which bit them and how long it gnawed at them. Even rich people who could pay any money for smuggled food, the practice of *schleichhandlung*, as they call it, over and above the allowance of their ration cards, found it hard to get

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

enough to satisfy their appetites. Even they were always a little hungry, just to the point of thinking continually of food, remembering their last good meals, anticipating the next, so that, as I am told by them, it became an obsession. The middle classes, not rich enough for much in the way of *schleichhandlung* (which is smuggling), and kept to the strict severity of official rationing, never, for two years, had enough to eat, or at least never enough nutritious food. They indulged in chemical products, *ersatz* food, which gave them a false sense of satisfaction for a time, but no red corpuscles. They saw their children withering, weakening. In the poorer classes there was real starvation, and the women and children were victims of tuberculosis and every kind of illness due to lack of milk and fats. Women fainted at their work. A strange drowsiness crept over them, so that working girls would drop asleep in tramcars, as I saw them after the armistice, through sheer anæmic weakness. For the children of the cities the last two years of war and the first years of peace were doom years. They, like the babes of Vienna, were so rickety that they did not grow bones in their bodies, but only gristle.

It was at the beginning of 1916 that the pinch began. By October of 1916, when the milk ordinances were in force, most cities had lost their last chance of fat sufficiency. German scientists, confirmed by British, have worked out the statistics of "calories" required for a workingman of middle weight as 3,300 a day.

In the summer of 1916 the German folk were reduced to 1,985 *per capitum*. In the winter 1916-17 they were reduced to 1,344, and in the summer of 1917 to 1,100. The majority of the German folk were obliged to exist on a third of the means of life necessary for normal nourishment. The effect on childbirth and child life was devastating. The birth rate went down during

## THE NEW GERMANY

the war by 40 per cent, and the death rate of children reached sinister figures.

In Prussia 50,391 children between one and fifteen years of age died in 1918, compared with 27,730 in the year before the war. In Mecklenburg-Schwerin, an agricultural state, 819 children died in 1918, compared with 360 in 1914. Tuberculosis ravaged children of all ages, as well as adults, mostly women, and in 1915 there were 61,000 deaths; in 1916, 66,544; in 1917, 87,032; and in 1918 over 97,000—from that disease, directly due to undernourishment.

Almost worse than the deaths was the weakness of the living, thousands of children crippled for life by hip and joint diseases, and so weakened for life by the hardships of their early days that in 1919 a careful analysis of school children proved that 60 per cent of them were from one and a half to two years underdeveloped, according to the normal standards of their ages. Even in this year 1921 the percentage of children underdeveloped to that extent in the industrial cities remains very high.

So the German people suffered, and the worst thing that women suffered, and many men, was to see their children weakening and dying, or never gaining in health and strength. No wonder, poor souls, that they wished well to a U-boat war which should break the blockade and let food in, did not cry out against the cruelty even of a *Lusitania* sinking in which the bodies of babes were delivered to the sea, because of millions of German children doomed to death if the blockade lasted with its deadly grip upon German life. To break that net anyhow, by any violence, by any cruelty, was justified in the souls of German men and women besieged through the years of war and watching the blight upon the children they had brought into an evil world. So, if I had been a German father, I should have thought, and so would you, I guess, who read this book.



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

When the armistice was made, the German folk looked for relief. "At last," they said, "the blockade will be broken and our children saved!" But month after month, as the peace treaty was being drafted and discussed by four or five leisurely and self-interested men, pleased with their high mission to alter the structure of European geography and to build a new world, the blockade was kept tight, and month after month more German babies died, more withered, more sickened with horrible disease. "The justice of God!" said certain pious souls in England. If that is God's justice, it is not pitiful. But it is man's cruelty, and we cannot shelter ourselves behind the back of God. The German folk were bitter against us for that. I think they had a right to be bitter, and that the verdict of history will be against us for that. We had beaten them into absolute surrender. Our force was enough to impose our terms without the need of baby-starving. Nor is it a defense to say that the Germans would have been harsher with us if they had won. Gentlemen do not regulate their conduct by the standard of those whom they condemn as brutes, or should not do so, I imagine. We had such power over our beaten enemy that we could have forgone the privilege of cruelty in that and other things.

There was one thing we did which was the worst form of cruelty—cruelty to animals. That was our holding back the prisoners of war a year and more after the armistice. Even as I write there are still some German prisoners in France, serving terms of punishment. Frightful! It was justified according to the law, utterly unjustified in human psychology. Imagine those poor wretches, just like animals, caged, fed, powerless to resist or protest. The war was over and they had rejoiced at its ending. The war had finished for fighting men, and through their barbed-wire cages they saw ours



## THE NEW GERMANY

marching for home again, cheering, joyous. Month after month they stayed on, sick with *Heimweh*, suffering torture of soul for their own women and babes. In Germany this was torture, too. I saw postcards written to the caged men by their women and children. "Why don't you come home, dear father? The war is over. Why do the English still keep you prisoners?" They were kept as hostages of German surrender until some went mad and tried to kill themselves.

Then at last, in the autumn of 1919, I saw them going back, trainloads of them, passing over a railway bridge in Cologne. Each train was decked with branches of green stuff; from every window the liberated prisoners leaned out, waving red flags and red rags. I wondered at the reason of that red color. Were they all revolutionarists, going to make trouble because of their bitterness? The people of Cologne rushed out to the bridge to cheer them. But many people I saw could not cheer. They burst into tears, and stood there weeping. Those were truckloads of human tragedy, a year late for peace. It would have been a larger thing if we had let them go before. It would have done good, and no harm, as a generous act. We had small men, with small brains and small hearts, at the top of things.

### IV

The history of Germany after the armistice and just before was a strange study in human psychology. Their "revolution" was the mildest thing of its kind ever known in the turmoil of a nations ruin. It began with a mutiny in the fleet when the seamen marched from Kiel with the red flag, gathering adherents of soldiers, self-demobilized, ruffians liberated from prison, and young boys eager for exciting adventures in the way of shoplifting and looting. Through many towns marched

mannandled, having their  
of rank torn from their unif  
selves remove those symbol  
did, in a fearful way. But  
ble, and there were no scene  
ate cruelty. Simultaneously  
through Germany the ren  
keeping good order, marchin  
pline, except when, at each  
cut off their badges and but  
life. The home-coming men  
by their folk. They were he  
in many great battles, won  
had been defeated, not by la  
guard resistance had been st  
by their own dwindling numbe  
overwhelming pressure of th  
were garlanded with flowers  
the war; and we need not  
admire the spirit of that w  
men.

The red-flag columns, lo  
playing at revolution, were no  
said, but they terrified

## THE NEW GERMANY

order. From Cologne, in which the revolutionary seamen had played their usual farce, came an urgent request that our troops should occupy the city before schedule time, and when our first patrols of cavalry, which I accompanied, entered the Dom-Platz, they were received not as enemies, but as friends. Strange paradox, but easily understood by those who knew the German dread of anarchy, their instinctive and inherited traditions of civic discipline, and their immense relief that the drain of German blood had stopped at last.

The flight of the Kaiser and the proclamation of the Republic comprised the German revolution over the whole territory of the old Empire, except in Berlin, where there was some short and desperate street fighting, not between supporters of the old regime and the new Republicans, but between the new Republicans and the communists, or Spartacists as they called themselves, with Bolshevik ideals, under the leadership of Karl Liebknecht. A Provisional Government had been formed by Liberal and Moderate Socialists, of whom the chiefs were Ebert, Scheidemann, and Erzberger, with Doctor Solf as Foreign Minister. In the background were the Junkers and the old imperial bureaucracy, lying low, watching events with an anxiety that was gradually allayed when they realized that the German people were not out for anarchy, nor for vengeance against their old leaders, but in a vast majority were hostile to the small bodies of Spartacists. It was also made clear by Scheidemann and his colleagues (men who had been loyal throughout the war and stanch supporters of every act of military autocracy, in spite of a thin camouflage of democratic protest) that they were determined to establish the Republic on the old traditions of imperialism without the Emperor, or at least as protectors of capital and buorgeois interests.

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

The military leaders [says an eyewitness of the revolution (my friend Percy Brown, in his valuable book, *Germany in Dissolution*)] were at a loss. They had expected the long-suffering masses to turn savagely on their late masters. Hundreds of high officers had fled the country to find that peace and defeat had found Germany merely bewildered, without a sign of revengeful temper. They found the sailors, the only people who really revolted, offering to protect the property of the wealthy until order was restored! If the General Staff had had any sort of a plan by which they could have saved their faces, they could have suppressed the revolutionary movement as easily and as completely as they have kept the people down since Bismarck showed them the way.

Karl Liebknecht and his revolutionary companion, Rosa Luxemburg, as the leaders of the Spartacist groups, the only people who believed in a real revolution of the laboring masses against the forces of capital and of bourgeoisie, in the true style of Lenin, were feared "worse than the plague," says the writer I have already quoted. They organized revolutionary outbreaks and took forcible possession of the *Vorwärts* and other newspaper offices. They were given short shrift by the Green Guards, or military police, of Berlin, under the command of Noske, who had the brain and temper of a Prussian general. With field artillery and machine guns, flame throwers and bombs, the government forces surrounded the Spartacist strongholds and shot their defenders to pieces. Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, who had believed in the quick success of the insurrection against the Provisional Government in Berlin, had been trying to rally up the provinces. They remained in hiding after the collapse of their comrades in Berlin, until captured by a trick of Noske's officers. On their way to prison they were brutally murdered. The "revolution" was at an end, except for sporadic outbursts of a feeble kind here and there. It was no revolution at all, in the old sense of the word. No wild wave of fury swept over the German people

## THE NEW GERMANY

because of the ruin and defeat into which they had been led by their rulers. There was no bloody vengeance against the military and aristocratic caste which had used the bodies of humble men as gun fodder for their imperial ambitions, and poisoned their very souls by a damnable philosophy of militarism, and for years had disciplined them brutally into servitude. No red flames made bonfires of the country houses into which the Junkers had slunk sulkily. Ludendorff and Von Tirpitz did not dangle from the crossbars of German lamp-posts, nor any other men whose arrogant conceit had brought their country into the deep gulfs of ruin, playing like gamblers with the fate of an empire, and then, when they lost, blaming the people who were victims of this insanity. The Allied peoples would have been more satisfied with the sincerity of a "change of heart" among the German folk if some of their chief thugs had been slit from ear to ear, if there had been something in the Russian style, which they deplored in Russia but desired in Germany. Not a bloodthirsty man myself, I am tempted by the thought that it would have been well if the high military caste and the Junkers of the old regime had been swept out of the country by their own folk under a sentence of lifelong banishment. It would have helped the world forward, and German democracy could have claimed greater generosity from the peoples of other nations.

The German people whom I met after the armistice were stupefied by the immense surrender of all their old pride, and bewildered by the uncertain future ahead of them. I could find no hate in them for the English, and no hate for the authors of their own tragedy. For the Kaiser they had no passionate enthusiasm, but a little pity, a little contempt, and a latent sentiment which they could not annul. They did not, and do not, believe that he "willed the war." They regarded him as a

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

figurehead used by the German High Command, and a lover of peace. Out of the depths of their ruin they remembered him in the old days of German splendor and success, a fine personality, the head of the house of Hohenzollern, which was identified with the glory of Prussia and the Empire. They would not fight to get him back, they did not yearn to have him back, but they had no grudge against him. So also it was with Hindenburg, who, unlike Ludendorff—unpopular everywhere—remained with the armies to the end and associated himself with the German people in defeat as well as in victory. His soldiers remembered the magic of his name when he had directed them to victory. Other generals also, the commanders in the field, received that tribute of remembrance which softened the charge against them of reckless leadership to ruin. The “revolution,” therefore, was not one of popular fury or vengeance. The very magnitude of their disaster united the German people for self-preservation after the war, and they saw clearly that disunion, anarchy, would lead them into deeper and blacker pits of ruin. That fear of anarchy to an order-loving people, long trained in the philosophy of bourgeois life, protection of property, industry, commerce, was the dominant thought of the masses of German folk, overwhelming all other instincts. . . . And always Russia was a ghastly warning.

So they supported Ebert, Scheidemann, and the moderate program of the Majority Socialists, with their allegiance to bureaucratic traditions and governmental authority. Later they swung more and more to the Right rather than to the Left, to the *Deutsches Volkspartei* with its imperial convictions, and to even more reactionary groups. That was when the Treaty of Versailles was revealed in the full measure of its severity and ruthlessness, and when French and

## THE NEW GERMANY

British opinion, especially the opinion of French and British newspapers, convinced the German people that they were still regarded as outside the pale of civilization, could hope for no generosity, for no mercy, for no fair play, even, from the Allied Powers and their Supreme Council. Under the goad of constant insults—still called “Huns” and “Boches,” liars and monsters—and under the menace of military “sanctions,” and in the grip still of that blockade by starvation, the German spirit which had been ready for democratic union with other peoples in the League of Nations and for liberation from its old traditions, reacted and hardened and was filled with bitterness.

Their revolution had been real to a degree which we do not even yet admit. It had replaced the Emperor by Ebert the tailor, and all the other kings of Germany had fled. More than that, it did represent a great change in the moral and spiritual outlook of the German people. Gone were the arrogant officers swaggering along the sidewalks and thrusting civilians to the gutter. Gone was all the military pomp and pride which had assumed so great a place in their national life. The immensity of their losses in men and wealth, the staggering figures of their national debts, the inevitability and enormity of the price they would have to pay, shocked the soul of Germany to its innermost recesses, uprooted the very foundations of their old faith, and gave them an entirely new vision regarding their past history and their future place. I am convinced from all I heard in Germany after the armistice—though at that time my observation was limited to the occupied zone—that the German people would have responded eagerly and thankfully to any touch of chivalry and to any conviction of real justice. They did not want to avoid punishment, but they hoped, these men and women who were victims of war, that it would not be



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

greater than human nature itself could bear without revolt, nor so cruel and vindictive as to reduce them to despair. President Wilson had made great promises to democracy in his Fourteen Points, and he had included the German people in his pledges if they got rid of their old rulers and established a democratic government. Well, the German people had proclaimed their Republic, and Ebert the tailor was their President, and it was stable and lasting and free from anarchy. They had fulfilled their part and shared the hopes of the peoples in open covenants openly arrived at, and the self-determination of nations. There were mass meetings in Berlin, with great placards on which was written "Give us the Fourteen Points!" But they, like all the world, saw that the peace treaty did not fulfill those promises, and carved up Europe regardless of racial boundaries and economic sense. Vienna was condemned to death. The independence of Poland was created at the expense of large German populations placed under Polish domination. Germans and Austrians in the Tyrol were handed over to Italy. And in every clause of the peace treaty the German people saw themselves doomed, as they believed sincerely, though erroneously, I think, to an industrial and commercial servitude which would deprive them for generations to come of all profit out of their own labor, and all hope of recovery. Worse to them even than that pronouncement of doom were the menaces by which it was accompanied. English newspapers, which had cried out to God for vengeance against the "Hun" who sent aircraft to bomb defenseless cities, advocated the bombing of German cities, if the representatives of Germany refused to sign the terms of peace. "Strong Allied airdromes on the Rhine and in Poland," wrote the *Evening News*, "well equipped with the best machines and pilots, could quickly persuade the inhabitants of the large German cities

## THE NEW GERMANY

of the folly of having refused to sign the peace. Those considerations are elementary. For that reason they may be overlooked. They are milk for babes."

That last sentence was a sneer against certain sentimentalists in England who desired to raise the blockade and allow German babies to get some milk. But to enforce the terms of peace, if refusal were contemplated, German babies and German women were to be blown to bits in large numbers as a means of persuasion to their statesmen. The German women and children, indeed, were to be the victims of our policy of enforcing the peace, in any case, and so it happened. The Junkers were still well fed in their country houses. Ludendorff did not go without his meals. Von Tirpitz did not have to swallow his whiskers. It was the women and children, overcrowded in tenement houses, dying of tuberculosis, ravaged by rickets, who were made the hostages of the German government. As pointed out by Mr. Norman Angell in his book, *The Fruits of Victory*, Mr. Winston Churchill described the character of the blockade when speaking in the House of Commons on March 3, 1919.

"This weapon of starvation falls mainly on the women and children, upon the old and the weak and the poor, after all the fighting has stopped." And then he added, not a plea for mercy, but the cold statement that we were enforcing the blockade with vigor, and would continue to do so.

Mr. Norman Angell is not going beyond the bounds of justice when he shows the utter lack of connection in the public mind or conscience between our foreign policy and the famine in Europe.

This was revealed in a curious way at the time of the signature of the Treaty. At the gathering of the representatives the German delegate spoke sitting down. It turned out afterward that he was so ill and distraught that he dared not trust himself to stand up.

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

Every paper was full of the incident, as also that the paper-cutter in front of him on the table was found afterward to be broken; that he placed his gloves upon the copy of the Treaty, and that he had not thrown away his cigarette on entering the room. These were the offenses which prompted the *Daily Mail* to say: "After this no one will treat the Hun as civilized or repentant." Almost the entire Press rang with the story of "Rantzau's insult." But not one paper, so far as I could discover, paid any attention to what Rantzau had said. He said:

"I do not want to answer by reproaches to reproaches. . . . Crimes in war may not be excusable, but they are committed in the struggle for victory and in the defense of national existence, and passions are aroused which make the conscience of peoples blunt. The hundreds of thousands of noncombatants who have perished since November 11th by reason of the blockades were killed with cold deliberation, after our adversaries had conquered and victory had been assured them. Think of that when you speak of guilt and punishment."

No one seems to have noticed this trifle in presence of the heinousness of the cigarette, the glove, and the other crimes. Yet this was an insult indeed. If true, it shamefully disgraced England—if England is responsible. The public, presumably, did not care whether it was true or not.

It is, of course, certain that after the signature of the terms of peace the German officials delayed the fulfillment of its provisions, did all in their power to postpone some of its exactions, failed, not perhaps deliberately (because of the weakness of undernourished workmen), to make full deliveries of coal, and in the figures presented to the Allied experts from time to time, underestimated the taxable wealth of Germany and her industrial possibilities. That was inevitable and natural. Even people condemned to death do not slip the noose gratefully upon their own necks and ask to be called early for execution. With regard to figures, no amount of anxiety for arithmetical accuracy could prevent a wide difference of calculation between German and Allied experts, both of whom were, and still are, without exact evidence as to the possibilities of German

## THE NEW GERMANY

industrial and commercial development upon which the payments of indemnities depend. The factors were then, and still are, uncertain. They depend upon the capacity of other countries to buy German goods, upon the future of Russia, the value of the German mark, the policy of the United States regarding credits, the attitude of France regarding Westphalia and Siberia, the good or bad behavior of the Poles, the health and energy of German workmen, the reason or madness of the Supreme Council and Allied politicians,—all very unstable and incalculable quantities upon which to base an estimate of German wealth. Naturally the German experts presented figures which opposed those of the Allied experts. That was not a crime. It was not even insincerity. It was a psychological inevitability. Yet we made a crime of it, and French and British newspapers flamed into passion against the “insults” of the German offers. “They will cheat you yet, those Junkers!” They were proclaimed to be “ridiculous and insulting” in the French Press, before ever they had been received in Paris. All German offers, even to reconstruct the devastated territories, were denounced as “the deliberate evasion of solemn pledges,” and the months dragged on, and the years, while “the fruits of victory” were counted on unplanted trees, and could not be harvested.

### v

In the Allied countries men who called themselves statesmen and were mostly little pettifogging politicians worrying about their own places and prestige and public favor, proclaimed the most fantastic promises to their peoples about making Germany “pay.” The Germans were to be made to pay all the war costs of all the Allied nations, including pensions. When one

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

sets out the simple fact again that England in four and a half years of war spent as much as in two and a half centuries before, it is self-evident that no one nation, not even Germany, which had also exhausted her resources by the same supreme effort in destructive energy, could pay back all that expenditure of all the Allied nations, nor any great part of it. Yet the politicians promised, and knew that they lied. They promised in order to keep their people quiet. They promised to get the people's votes, but presently the time came when the people became impatient and full of wrath—especially the French people, who had suffered most and had been promised most, and looked out upon their ravaged lands. In April of 1921 the Bill of Costs was at last presented to Germany. After many rejected offers from the German experts the indemnities were fixed at figures below those regarded as a minimum in Paris, but so enormous that the figures meant nothing to the minds of people unused to the arithmetic of international finance, and were incalculable in their effect upon the world's markets even to financial experts. In the Paris Resolutions, afterward modified a little in method of payment, the Germans were called upon to pay 226 milliards of gold marks, spread over a period covering forty-two years, in the following sums:

Years	Amounts
1921-22.....	2 milliards of gold marks, annually
1923-25.....	3 " " " " "
1926-28.....	4 " " " " "
1929-31.....	5 " " " " "
1932-62.....	6 " " " " "

At the time of the presentation of this Bill of Costs it required fifteen German paper marks to make one gold mark, and it was of course obvious that apart from a transfer of currency insignificant compared with the

## THE NEW GERMANY

total bill, and by a transfer of credits and securities of very little value, owing to Germany's financial condition after war, the only method of payment would be by exports of merchandise, mainly in the form of manufactured articles.

In order to cover their own national expenses and pay the reparations demanded, the Germans would have to increase their exports by at least five times the prewar figures, exceeding the combined total exportation of manufactured goods by America and England. To achieve such a vast increase in exports after a devastating and ruinous war, the loss of colonies and ships, the slaughter of two million men, the undernourishment of many laborers during the years of war, the deterioration of machinery and rolling stock, and the heavy taxation of capital, would require an industrial effort amounting to the miraculous. If it were achieved, Germany would capture the world's trade and kill the exports of many competing nations, including England and the United States, but at the cost, perhaps, of her own well-being, owing to the necessity of low wages, severe restriction of food imports, and the enormous taxation upon all that terrific energy.

It was impossible for the average German to say whether such an adventure in arithmetic were humanly possible or not. Presented with the figures, he was stunned by their enormity and believed that acceptance would involve his people in a life of slavery for generations to come. He was tempted to repudiate them and let happen what would happen. The German government under Doctor Simon resigned rather than sign. It seemed doubtful whether any government could be found to sign. Days passed, and no government was found to accept the humiliating task, while the date of the ultimatum fast approached.

As it approached, passion rose high in France; the

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

French people, with some exceptional groups, were enraged with the delay in getting their fruits of victory, any fruit. "Make them pay!" was the shout of the French masses, led by the French newspapers, and echoed, more doubtfully, in England. Aristide Briand, Prime Minister of France, promised to make them pay by sending "the gendarme to put his hand on the collar of the debtor to collect the debt." His gendarme was the 1919 class of twenty-two-year-old youths, whom he called to the colors and sent up to the Rhine, ready to march into Westphalia, or the Ruhr, as it was called, and seize the German industrial cities like Essen, Elberfeld, and others, with their chief coal fields and factories, in lieu of payment. By such an act they would have crippled Germany, but also they would have lost the greater part of their indemnities, too. And by such an act they would have insured another war for another generation of French and German youth, without any manner of doubt. But a few days before the ultimatum expired, a new Chancellor, Doctor Wirth, found a government which agreed to sign. And the terms to which his signature was written as a solemn pledge were read out by him in a deadly silence of the Reichstag. Germany had promised to pay, and thereto had plighted her faith, as far as human possibility.

### VI

It was not long after that pledge was made that I went to Berlin to study the conditions of life in Germany, and to get some clear idea, by diligent inquiry of many minds, upon the possibility of payment and the chance of the future in Germany.

Apart altogether from information I obtained from German bankers, business men, political leaders, and ordinary citizens, checked, but mostly confirmed, by



## THE NEW GERMANY

our own financial experts, and by one very wise American—Raymond Swing of the New York *Herald*—my personal observations of Berlin life showed me in a very few days that a remarkable change had come over the spirit and conditions of the people during the time that had followed the war and the defeat. There in Berlin, and in other cities through which I passed, the people were no longer dejected and despairing. Most of them, the ordinary citizens, were wonderfully cheerful. Something had happened to brace them up, to make them keen, to give them a resolute and confident purpose. It was easy to see what had happened. It was work. Everybody who could get any kind of job was working at high pressure and with enthusiasm. A peculiar phenomenon in Europe after war!

I had just left England and London, in the time of the coal strike and of the greatest trade slump in our modern history, when the streets of the poorer districts were thronged with listless, workless men, hanging round the labor exchanges to get their government "doles," or rattling collecting boxes in the faces of the passers-by. Everywhere in London then, and in other cities, one noticed slackness in the mental attitude of men, working or not working. They were not keen on their jobs. They were lazy or "tired." The laboring men in trade unions were deliberately limiting their output, so that to watch, as some days I watched, bricklayers building new houses, was a mixture of tragedy and comedy—comedy because of their Pavlova-like attitudes with hods and ladders, their languorous way with bricks and mortar, their frequent rests between the exertion of squaring one brick and another, their long and careful lighting of pipes, their eloquence and argument among one another as to the right thing to do, if ever it were done; and tragedy because of this object lesson in the way to lose our chance of recovery. . . . In Hyde



...ing about, into  
Even in the hotels, the  
traffic from entrance hall  
for idle pastime or amorous  
little black satchels under  
papers, and, sitting in  
offers, exports, prices, all  
seemed to be doing well, doing  
whatever their profits might  
streets of Berlin were obvious  
things were going with the  
no hangdog look about them.  
Their clothes were rather  
many men of the working  
old field-gray jackets without  
—three years after war—and  
not the *chic* touch of French  
they were clean and neat and  
pretty. The war strain seen  
from them. Hunger no longer  
was clear to see that hundreds  
folk not only had enough for  
a little margin beyond that for  
hours of leisure after a working  
T —

## THE NEW GERMANY

there are fireworks displays and always a band playing gay music before a painted scene of wild and whirling women. The outdoor restaurant holds fifty thousand people, and on the evening I went, typical, I was told, of any other evening, there was hardly a vacant place. I watched all these people curiously, and one of the German bankers smiled at me and said, "Do they look like barbarians—the Huns?" They were a vast crowd of bourgeoisie—clerks, shopgirls, working-class families, respectable middle-class men and women with their children. It was a hot evening, and all the girls were in light cotton frocks, with very little underneath, I guess. "Cheap stuff," said the German lady by my side, "but easily made and good to wash." Everybody was drinking light beer or coffee, or sipping iced drinks, or eating ices. I reckoned that it would cost them about five to ten marks a head, fivepence to tenpence in English money, ten cents to twenty in American money. There was no rowdyism, no drunkenness. I only saw one policeman in the great crowds, and he was not required by people who were enjoying themselves in a cheerful, orderly way. The side-shows, with special entrance fees, were crammed. People were wasting paper marks in lotteries for chocolate and bottles of scent, spending paper marks freely on "flip-flaps" and "wiggly-woggles" and scenic railways.

"How is it," I said, "that all these people have so much money to spend? I cannot understand it, after an inquiry into the wages of clerks and shopgirls—seven hundred and fifty marks a month for clerks, much less than that for shopgirls, and the mark worth no more than twopence in purchasing power, even within Germany, and half that in foreign exchange."

"Frankly, I cannot understand it, either," said the German lady. "I would like to tell you that this place gives you a false idea of our prosperity, and that there

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

is terrible poverty in the working districts. That would not be quite true. There is terrible poverty, still, as in all great cities of Germany, but this scene is typical of many others. It shows that millions of people have a little money to spend on pleasure."

She thought out an explanation. I think it was a sound one. "It is like this. A single girl, or young man, having to live on what she or he earns alone, has a hard struggle. It is almost impossible to live on seven hundred and fifty marks a month. The cheapest shirt costs fifty marks; a pair of boots two hundred and fifty; the simplest, cheapest meal in a restaurant twenty marks, and then not enough for health and strength. But families pool their earnings. If there are two or three sisters and a brother all working and living at home with a father and mother getting good wages, then there is a margin for pleasure like this. They stint and scrape at home, where they live overcrowded, in order to come out in the evenings and enjoy themselves. They must have this kind of pleasure—fresh air, music, cheerful company, the joy of youth. There is too much love of pleasure, and it leads to immorality. Young girls will sell themselves for a pretty frock or a night of dancing. The war loosened the old moralities. Youth is enormously tempted."

After that evening in Luna Park, I went to an office in Berlin which has to do with the feeding of destitute children by German charity. It was a German lady who gave me some information about the state of child life in Berlin. She was a young woman, with the fine gold-spun hair of the prettiest type of Prussian girl, and blue eyes. I guessed by her manner that she belonged to the aristocratic caste. She spoke frankly of the improvement in the condition of children, thanks to the charity of the Quakers, the Americans, and the work of

## THE NEW GERMANY

German societies. But there was still a great deal of tuberculosis, owing to overcrowding in tenement houses, and undernourishment among children of parents who could not get work because of ill health or the crippling wounds of war. There was still a great lack of milk for babies.

Then she spoke of the professional classes, and put herself among them.

"We are hard hit, and do not get much help. A pension which was good before the war is now no good at all, owing to the fall of the mark. Even our children do not get the care of the working classes, perhaps because of our pride. I have a little boy—"

She hesitated at making personal revelations, but then explained that her husband, a German officer, had been killed in the war, and that her boy never had enough to eat until, swallowing pride, she had sent him to the soup kitchens. She was paid seven hundred and fifty marks a month for her present work, which she was lucky to get. But without family help it was not enough for life.

"Clothes eat up our wages," she said. "In work like this, receiving visitors, one must dress decently. It is very difficult. One has to go to bed while one's underclothing is in the wash!"

She shook hands and laughed.

"Perhaps things will get better presently."

That was a little glimpse behind the scenes of the outward welfare I saw in Berlin, and doubtless there are hundreds of women like that who have to fight a desperate struggle for decent livelihood, as in most countries of Europe.

That did not alter my conviction that Germany, as a whole, was recovering from the exhaustion of war and regaining a fair measure of prosperity, by a combined intense industrial effort. Her factories were producing

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

again at full pace, and at a price which could undersell all competitors.

Better than statistics, clearer to the vision, in showing the variety and activity of German manufacturers, was a visit to a great stores, like that of Wertheim, corresponding to Harrod's, Barker's, and Selfridge's in England, or Marshal Field's in Chicago. On floor after floor was a display of manufactured articles, porcelain, pottery, leather goods, metal ware, every object of household use and ornament, excellent in design, and, reckoned in foreign exchanges, marvelously cheap. Reckoning the mark at one penny, here was a competition which would beat the markets of the world. I was particularly struck by the book department, remembering the shoddy appearance of English publications and their abominable cost—a bad novel on bad paper for seven-and-sixpence, a "cheap" reprint for two shillings, a volume of history or philosophy for fifteen shillings, horribly produced in flimsy bindings. These German books were printed on splendid paper, well illustrated, well bound, most tastefully produced. A new novel was fifteen marks, or one-and-threepence; the classics of the world were to be had for eight and a half marks.

But the metal goods were even more astonishing in their cheapness, and as I reckoned about a quarter of the price to be found in English shops.

"Tariff or no tariff," said a friend of mine, "how are we going to compete with German goods when, for instance, a safety razor, equal in quality to Gillette's, can be sold wholesale for ninepence?"

He laughed, but I detected a note of anxiety in his voice when he said:

"Germany is working as no other people in the world, and her workingmen are getting sevenpence halfpenny an hour, compared with one-and-ninepence, or half a

## THE NEW GERMANY

crown in England, producing better stuff, and without limitation of output. What's going to be England's chance? Hugo Stinnes and the big trusts are organizing the greatest industrial machine the world has ever seen."

### VII

Every student of German life is now talking of Stinnes as the great industrial autocrat of Germany, and outside Germany he is regarded as a dark, sinister figure, a kind of evil genius, like a German Lenin, though his philosophy is the antithesis of Bolshevism. He is, undoubtedly, the most powerful personality in Germany to-day, the owner of sixty newspapers serving the interests of the *Deutsches Volkspartei*, and preaching his own gospel, which is the industrial supremacy of Germany by intensive production based upon cheap labor and revolutionary methods of manufacture, obtaining the highest degree of efficiency, power, combination, and distribution. Creating a gigantic trust for the polling of immense resources of raw material, capital, and labor, his method is to build vertically from coal, iron, and steel to all branches of manufacture in which these raw materials are used, and to capture the world's markets by a quality and cheapness which will put German goods beyond competition. As a young man, he inherited enormous estates, mines, ironworks, and royalties valued at seven million pounds sterling. There was no branch of his own industries in which he did not have technical and personal knowledge. Not the humblest laborer in his employ could stand up and tell him about conditions of life which he had not learned by sweat of body and toil of mind. He had worked as a pit boy, coal hewer, mine foreman. He had been stoker, engineer, ship's officer, and sea captain. He was a slave driver to his own workmen, and imported

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

Polish labor to keep wages low. His philosophy of life would have been heartily indorsed by a Manchester mill owner of the early nineteenth century, using women and children as slaves of the machines. The Stinnes Trust consisted last year of six great companies employing two hundred and fifty thousand men and having a capital of twelve million marks, but always their tentacles are stretching out to more industries—of electricity, coal, iron, shipping, and factory work, absorbing their capital and power and extending their activities over fresh fields. Every form of by-product is used and marketed. Other countries are being invaded by the Stinnes power. The blast furnaces of Austria are working again with the raw material sent to them by his headquarters. He is negotiating in Hungary for enormous ironworks. The iron ore of Upper Silesia finds its way to his factories. His agents are active in Russia, and he is ready to rebuild their worn-out railways, to manufacture engines at the rate of eight thousand a year, and trucks at the rate of sixty thousand, when the time comes for Russia to do business again.

Stinnes is only one, though the most powerful, of the German industrial kings who are succeeding to the old monarchies of the Empire. August Thyssen is another employing a hundred and twenty-five thousand men, of whom sixty-five thousand are at Muelheim, which is one great city of furnaces and factories. Peter Kloeckner is another of the steel and iron magnates with a capital as great as that of old man Thyssen, and second in the list of coal producers. More romantic to the imagination is the transformation of Krupp's. After the years of war and prewar activity during which they produced nothing but great guns and armaments of all kinds, they accepted instantly the conditions of military defeat and with marvelous rapidity and skill

## THE NEW GERMANY

adapted their machinery to the demands of peace. Railway engines, agricultural implements, cash registers, every kind of metal work, are produced in vast quantities in the sheds where great guns and machine guns were once produced, and in every part of the world the agents of Krupp are exploring new markets, arranging contracts, feeling the pulse of trade.

These trusts are acquiring a tremendous social power in the German state which one day may quickly take over the state. Already they are proposing to tax themselves for the benefit of the German Reich, according to their own calculations of industrial revenue and the taxable value of their output. A certain amount of latitude is given to the views of the workers, who are represented by councils, and their wages are regulated according to the standard cost of life sufficient to keep them in working health. In the summer of 1921 that was reckoned at about sixty marks for a full working day, or five shillings in English money. It is to some extent an actual demonstration of the French *syndicat* idea, and it is within the bounds of possibility that it is a new form of government by industrial trusts gradually absorbing the power and control of the state. At present, however, political ideas are being kept subordinate to the need of the economic reconstruction of Germany, and it is to the industrial genius and energy of these organizers that Germany owes it that she is recovering steadily from the enormous exhaustion of war.

By the summer of 1921 Germany's coal production amounted to about two-thirds of the prewar quantity; and half the amount of prewar tonnage (though largely under foreign flags) was coming to the port of Hamburg, which had been silent and deserted for so many years. The deposits in the big banks had gone up by fifty per cent in little more than a year. The effect of the



trade was increasing in n  
push was being made in the  
South America. While in F  
with February, 1920, South  
whole of Europe went down  
that with Germany alone inc  
In 1919 Germany sent to th  
million dollars' worth of  
eighty-eight million dollars'  
Britain thoroughly beaten  
in European countries, sen  
example, motor cars, motor  
sixty times the value of Britis  
In Holland especially she ha  
hold than in the year before

All these facts reveal the p  
astonishing for a country so u  
of blood and treasure, so pov  
the military and economic me  
France. Yet this progress di  
to the prosperity of prewar co  
from the fantasies of French  
one might imagine that Ger  
miracle. had gained now ...



## THE NEW GERMANY

war debts and the indemnities which she had pledged herself to pay.

### VIII

In Berlin I attended the meeting of the Reichstag when Doctor Wirth, the Chancellor, outlined, broadly and vaguely, the manner in which he proposed that Germany should pay that Bill of Costs. All his oratory could be reduced to four words—intense industry, economy, efficiency. It was, nevertheless, a historic scene, memorable and exciting to me, as to all those German Deputies who listened to words which emphasized heavily and without optimism the enormous burden which Germany must support for half a century. From the extreme Left, where sat the little communist group, came derisive cries, and from the extreme Right of Junker tradition occasional outbursts of anger and scorn. But mostly those men sat silent, moody, introspective.

To me the scene in the assembly and in the lobbies outside was astonishing as a psychological adventure. Here were many of the men who in this same building had heard the declaration of war and echoed the proclamation of many victories, had listened exultantly to the terms of peace which would be imposed upon England and France, had year after year voted the supplies to carry on the war, and, at last, had faced, here again, the news of utter, irretrievable defeat and ruin. Count Bernstorff passed me in the lobby, and I had some words with him, watching his debonair manner, detecting a faint trace of American accent. If he had been a greater diplomat and an honest man, perhaps Germany would not have lost the war. . . . Scheidemann went by, the Socialist who put his party at the service of the militarists with the same patriotic fervor as the Labor Party did in England. . . . Not many

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

other men did I know, even by name, but I knew them as those who represented the German people at a time when any Englishman coming to this Reichstag would have been killed like a rat, and when No-Man's Land, with its death pits, divided them and us. Queer to be standing in the midst of them, listening to that talk! A little shiver passed down my spine as the thought came to me. A German coming to our House of Commons for the first time after war would perhaps be affected in the same way.

The change in the attitude of men one to another was suggested at a dinner table in Berlin one night, when I sat next to a German banker who had fought all through the war, and opposite a British major who was four years on the western front. It was the banker's brother who made the remark, in an aside to me.

"How ridiculous is war!" he said. "Three years ago your major and my brother would have tried to kill each other at sight. Now they are sitting at the same table, discussing political economy, and there is no temptation in the knives beside their plates!"

This gentleman made another remark which interested me. We were walking down the Friedrichstrasse, speaking English in loud voices, because of the crowd about us. No one turned to glance at us, there was no hostile look because of the English speech, and the German by my side pointed the moral.

"You see, we can speak English without arousing dislike. It is only the Germans in foreign countries who have to lower their voices when they speak their hated tongue."

There is indeed in Germany now no touch of hostility to English folk. On the contrary, their nationality is a passport to German favor in the hotels, in the street cars, anywhere. We are popular, strange as it may seem, and the Germans believe in our sense of

## THE NEW GERMANY

magnanimity and in our tradition for fair play. "*Gott strafe England!*" is a forgotten song, never, as a matter of fact, well known in Germany, though we made the most of it in war time. The strangest, most paradoxical, most grotesque revulsion of popular sentiment—yet, on the whole, hopeful to humanity—which struck my imagination in Berlin during that visit was when I stood amid a crowd of Germans reading a bulletin from Upper Silesia on the board of a newspaper office. It described the arrival of British troops into the disputed zone between the Poles and Germans. The Black Watch had come, and officers and men were being carried shoulder high and garlanded with flowers by the German population. The Black Watch! Three years before they were called "The Ladies from Hell" by the German soldiers, who dreaded their bayonet work, their ruthlessness in killing. Now they were the champions of German claims, the darlings of the German crowds.

"The English are our friends," said a German in the crowd. "The French will always be our enemies."

I moved away from the crowd with a sense of the irony of life and the idiocy of men. For four and a half years of frightful history we had called the Germans "Huns," had exhausted all our wealth and hurled the flower of our youth into the furnace fires in order to kill them in great numbers, as they killed us. The French had been our comrades, and we had (as we thought) sealed our friendship eternally by the mystical union of common sacrifice. Now British soldiers were being carried shoulder high by German people, and the French were scowling at us, even in Paris, if we spoke English so that the passers-by could hear. The bottom was knocked out of the meaning of the war, if ever it had any meaning beyond the bloody rivalry of politicians using the bodies and souls of men for their dirty

under Austro-German command  
Ukrainian adventurer, General I  
peace at Brest-Litovsk, and entre:  
into the Ukraine, and to deliver t  
in May, 1920, were the friends  
Minister at the time we were aid  
gentleman who filled the same po  
let loose the world war, insisted l  
helped to ruin the finances of the  
then, after the collapse, repeated  
On the other side, the command  
Brusiloff, who again and again sav  
and Austrian offensives. He is r  
nents our "allies." They are figh  
means all South Russia, away fr  
ceding year we sent millions to a  
French sent their troops to Odessa  
kin, in order to enable him to recove

How long is this madness  
Is there no hope at all in the  
seeing at last the monstrous  
ings and regroupings of arm  
directed now this way, now  
tions of statesmen who shift  
fer their allegiance as easily :

## THE NEW GERMANY

and both thoughts were inseparably linked. Could Germany pay the vast indemnities to which she was pledged, and would France and Great Britain so divide Upper Silesia that the Poles would remain in possession of the greatest stronghold of German industry? That the payment of indemnities depended upon the settlement of Upper Silesia in favor of German claims and German votes was the absolute and sincere belief not only of the Germans themselves, but of all British experts with whom I spoke. More even than the economic position of Germany was involved, though that would decide the fate of Europe. The German people believed it to be a test case of justice and "fair play" among the democracies of Europe. If the Polish insurgents were allowed to hold what they had seized against the authority of the Inter-Allied Commission and contrary to the German votes of six to four in the plebiscite which had been taken under Allied control, then Germany would know that in spite of her pledge to pay the penalties of defeat—and her payments—she was to be given no chance of recovery, nor any justice, and that the policy of France was to prevent her recovery upon any terms whatever.

That was the talk of a group of young Germans, obviously ex-officers, with whom I sat at table, waiting for an interview with Herr Stresemann, the leader of the *Deutsches Volkspartei* and the political representative of Hugo Stinnes, the industrial magnate. The scene was curious, for it was in the club of the *Volkspartei* after Doctor Wirth's speech in the Reichstag outlining the program for the payment of indemnities. With young Raymond Swing, the American correspondent, I was shown into an antechamber divided by a curtain from a room in which Stresemann was speaking to the members of his party. The waiter placed chairs for us and offered us refreshment. There was nothing

Presently the speech ended. A group of men, among whom I was, sat in the room in which I sat with Herr Strese- mann, in possession of small tables and chairs, and discussed their views on the situation. It was the eve of a day when the Allies, with the gigantic burdens of the war, showed no sign of dejection. They were cheerful, vivacious, and keen. Herr Strese- mann, however, broke away to ask for my name and introduced me to the group. He made a place for me at their table. The conversation turned to Upper Silesia. The Allies had allowed the Allies to take at the very time when Germany was imposing indemnities which would strain the country. Before I could answer, Strese- mann said, "At last!" and led me away from himself.

"What were you talking about at the group of men I had led to Silesia" and laughed, he said

## THE NEW GERMANY

whole economic position depends on that. There lie our main sources of raw material for manufactures. There exist our greatest strongholds of industry. German capital, labor, and organization have built up the prosperity of Silesia. Take that from us and we are crippled."

I had a long conversation with this energetic little man, who, everybody told me, was the ablest politician in Germany, sure of being Chancellor after the downfall of Doctor Wirth's weak Coalition. Reactionary in the sense of supporting the old traditions of German national pride and monarchist sentiment—"the Kaiser did not will the war," he said, very solemnly—he told me frankly that he has no use for democracy unless well disciplined and kept working. But he is progressive according to the ideals of Stinnes, his master, upon economic lines of advance.

He spoke to me at length about French policy and his voice took a deeper note of passion.

"The instincts of the German people," he said, "are for peace. Our future is in peace and not in war. We would willingly have made friends with France and worked to repair her ruin, if her people had been only a little generous, only a little courteous, after our defeat. But they have done their best, and are doing it, to arouse feelings of enmity and rage. In our occupied districts they have been needlessly arrogant."

He told me a story of how the French general fined the Mayor of Duisburg (which French troops entered to enforce the signing of the indemnities) the sum of five thousand marks for delay in answering his summons to appear before him, and when the mayor asked, very civilly, "What further wishes have you?" fined him another five thousand for using the word "wishes" instead of "commands." . . . I did not tell Herr Stresemann many similar and more painful stories of



trying to allay the hatred

He told me the French  
three mistakes to which N  
said, "My mistakes were  
let Poland be weak, and to

"French diplomacy now  
weaken Prussia, strength  
Russia, by setting up a cza

But their policy would fi  
is no tendency in Germany  
in spite of all French hopes  
will always be weak and  
of the inherent instability  
for Russia, French puppets  
had failed miserably, and  
Napoleon himself, could no  
Russia.

Stresemann went at lengt  
rations, and held the view t  
which Germany will desp  
her pledges, European peo  
maintaining such abnormal  
and will call another conf

## THE NEW GERMANY

which, as I previously knew, is one of the pet ideas of Hugo Stinnes.

"The war debts of all nations could be wiped out in a few years," said Stresemann, "by a small tax on raw material, like coal or cotton, paid by all purchasers and put into a common pool for that purpose."

In his opinion Germany, with the best will in the world, will be unable to continue her payment of indemnities for half a century, and this will be recognized, he thinks, by the increasing common sense of European peoples.

That, undoubtedly, was the official view of the *Deutsches Volkspartei*, but while I was in Berlin it was challenged by Rathenau, one of the greatest and most liberal-minded of social reformers in Germany, who said definitely in the Reichstag, as Minister of Reconstruction, "We can pay." Stresemann's pessimism was also repudiated by Scheidemann, leader of the Majority Socialists, with whom I had a talk in company with his friend and adviser, Doctor Helphand, a millionaire Socialist. In reply to my request for an interview, they sent an automobile for me in Berlin, and I journeyed out through the glorious woods of the Gr neward to the edge of Wansee, which is one of the beautiful lakes outside the city to which Berliners go for bathing and boating. A most pleasant spot for any Socialist, especially if he lived in such an elegantly furnished villa as that of Doctor Helphand.

I was curious to see Scheidemann, who helped to found the Republic after the war, in which he was but a mild critic of German militarism, and a staunch supporter of imperial policy and war credits until the great wreck happened. He came into the room a few minutes after my arrival, and in a light linen suit he looked to me like a French painter, with his tall, rather elegant figure, his silver hair, and little pointed beard.

Scheidemann's view of Germany's future, interpreted

which would go some way  
They could save other  
luxuries, by more efficient  
internal taxation. Their  
rapid trade development  
could pay their Bill of C  
helped and not hindered  
Germany would be put o  
be no possible payment  
Allies and the United St  
to give German industry  
wipe out all debts. To  
and capital to renew the  
and rolling stock, enorm  
war, and to develop their  
was waiting for them. A  
to ordinary methods of  
ready also to supply th  
agricultural implements,  
life, so repairing her d  
position and old trade r  
reconstruction would inev  
the German people would  
measure to the h. C.

## THE NEW GERMANY

trade. That was the hope of Germany. Surely, said Scheidemann, it was also the hope of Europe, whose common interests would be served.

I think these men spoke sincerely. I think that all the people I met in Berlin, and afterward on the Rhine, faced very frankly the realities of their situation. They were under no illusions. They knew and admitted that military power had passed from them, at least for a long time, and that they could resist nothing in the way of armed force set in motion by France and England. That, no doubt, is gall and wormwood to the old military caste, the Junkers, and the nationalists who look back to the old pomp and parade with the same ferocious sentiment, and forward to a war of revenge with hungry souls. But I believe, perhaps without sufficient evidence, that the mass of the German people, and many of their Republican leaders, like Scheidemann himself, are relieved by the disappearance of militarism, and do not want it back again, but look forward honestly to an era of industrial peace and progress by which they will lift Germany out of financial peril and gain great victories, even industrial supremacy, by the energy and genius of labor and science. Something has lifted from the German spirit. Even in Berlin the people, I am told by those who know them better than I do, are more *gemüthlig*, good natured, and open hearted. It is militarism which has been lifted from them. The old word "*verboten*," the old bullying of German youth in the barracks and on the parade ground, has passed as a dark spell. Everyday life is more agreeable without the swaggering bullies on the sidewalks. Citizenship is no longer oppressed by the military caste. Defeat has not been bad for them in every way, and in many ways may be the greatest blessing, cleansing to the soul of Germany, bracing to her national spirit. They see the mockery and futility of war and remember

Germany may raise its head  
pride, when the nation has  
sword of the Allies has been

I would not trust men lifted  
too far. They belong to  
not put any faith in the  
nature is not to be converted  
people who bore the agonies  
of its costs.

It is for us to help the  
uprising ever again of that  
once controlled them, and  
bring out our own devil in  
of the war makers in old a

## V

### THE PRICE OF VICTORY IN FRANCE

#### I

**A**FTER the day of armistice in 1918 the French people were filled with the intoxication of victory. The faith with which they had fought had been fulfilled. It was the faith that, in spite of the immense power of the Germans, their military supremacy at the beginning of the war in man power and machine power and the rippling blows they inflicted on France in the first rush and afterward, they would be beaten in the end, eaten to the dust, by the heroism of the French armies, the genius of French generals, and the unconquerable spirit of the French.

"*On les aura!*" ("We shall have them!") was the cry of France even in days when the enemy was sprawled over their northern provinces, when they struck close to the heart of Paris, and when masses of French troops were driven back from their frightful onslaughts.

It is true, as I know, that at times this faith in ultimate victory burned low in the hearts of some French men and women whose souls were staggered by the normous and unceasing slaughter of their youth, and by the narrow, hair-breadth line which sometimes stood between the safety and the death of France—as when the Germans reached the Marne in August of the first year, and again after years of infernal struggle which strewn the fields of France with death, in July, 1918. But the hope never flickered out into absolute despair,

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

rose again into a flame whenever the luck of war changed, and became a certainty of victory when, with American help and British, Marshal Foch hurled the enemy across the Marne for the second time and forced them into a retreat which only ended with absolute surrender.

So France rejoiced on the day of armistice, and on many other days that followed. The national pride of the French was satisfied. They were not ungrateful for the services of their allies and friends, but they believed that victory was due most of all to the heroic spirit of France. They had fought most, made greatest sacrifice, and won by the military genius of Foch. . . . As an Englishman, who saw, through the years of war, the valor of their men, the miseries and the courage of their women, the marvelous, unflinching, supernatural heroism of the whole French nation, I agree with them, though I know (more than they will ever know or admit) what British soldiers did, and, in the end, the Americans. Their joy in victory was my joy, too, though I wondered then, even in the midst of that wild intoxication of the Parisian crowds after the surrender of the enemy, how soon it would be before they were sobered by the remembrance of their million dead, their two million maimed, blind, and shell-shocked men, their enormous war debts, their devastated fields, their falling birth rate, their price of victory.

It was not very long before that remembrance, and the dreadful actuality of truth, came to them. Even on the day of armistice there were thousands of women who wept in small rooms and in back streets. "It is victory," they said, "but it will not bring back our men." Their tears were hidden because of the rejoicing of living youth, and their cry of anguish was stifled so that it should not be heard above the cheers which greeted the men who had come back with victory on their banners.

## THE PRICE OF VICTORY IN FRANCE

For some time after that the gradual awakening of the French people to a sense of dismal reality was soothed by the promises of their statesmen and diplomats. There were to be great fruits of victory harvested from the wealth of Germany. By the terms of the peace treaty, the Germans would be made to pay for all the damage they had done, apart from the resurrection of dead youth. They would be forced to pay indemnities which would reconstruct the ravaged lands of France, build up her ruins, wipe out the war debt, pay for the pensions of crippled men and widowed women. German coal from the Saar or the Ruhr would be delivered or seized, in return for the German destruction of the coal mines around Lens. The financial ruin of France, as revealed by the falling value of the franc in foreign exchange, and by the budget statements which admitted a lack of revenue to pay even the interests on unimaginable debts, would be restored by consignments of German gold. By the peace treaty also, ruthless in the severity of its terms to an ignoble and brutal enemy, France would be secured from the menace of further wars, because Germany would be so crushed and strangled and held so tightly to the forfeit of future payments, that she would never be allowed to recover her strength and power, however great the industry of her workers or the genius of her financiers.

### II

These promises that Germany would pay for everything were held up to the French people as an inducement to keep quiet, settle down to work, and suffer patiently their present poverty. There was to be a period of reconstruction under the direction of a benevolent government. For a year the word "reconstruction" was used as a kind of spell word to lull the impa-



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

tience and growing incredulity of French people. For another year French statesmen kept up the hope or the pretense that the fruits of victory were only delayed and that in a little while Germany would be made to disgorge the expenses of the war to the last sou. They still maintained their claim to the 261 milliards of francs, which represents more than twenty times the annual total of German exports at their maximum figure before the war, while Britain's claim amounted to 8,000 millions of pounds sterling, or, according to a financial authority, "far more than all the world's gold production since the dawn of history, plus the estimated contents of all the gold mines at present known."

Gradually public opinion in France became impatient of promises. They wanted the delivery of the gold. They wanted the fulfillment of the Treaty of Versailles, utterly and quickly. Germany had not fulfilled it. Her coal deliveries were short of the amounts required, she had delayed disarmament, she had taken no steps to punish her war criminals. Again and again she had delayed and dodged the payment of her indemnities. Even in the spring of 1921 the Allied governments had not decided upon their final terms, and Germany was still making offers which the whole of the French Press and the majority of French people (with the exception of the advanced Socialists) denounced passionately as ridiculous and insulting. They were offers monstrously out of keeping with the promise of "the fruits of victory," made by French statesmen to their people. Passion was rising to dangerous heights in France. Ex-President Poincaré directed part of it against England. It was *perfidie Albion* again thwarting the fulfillment of French claims by some secret pro-Germanism among their politicians and financiers, or some jealousy of France. Briand, the Prime Minister, had to get ready or go. Unless he could give the Chamber a

## THE PRICE OF VICTORY IN FRANCE

definite guaranty that Germany would at last be presented with her bill and forced to pay, he would be flung out of office by the representatives of the people's passion. To understand that passion, one must know the condition of life in France and the mentality of the French people.

To say that they were suffering from "soul sickness" is but a mild way of describing their disillusionment and disgust with the effects of victory. In their political activities as well as in their private life they showed an intense irritation with the state of affairs, and a sense of fear which had followed the intoxication of victory, a tendency to quarrel with those who were their friends and allies—because they thought that they who won the greatest share of victory had gained least of all from peace—and a desperate endeavor to grasp by any force in their power the fulfillment of their most fantastic hopes.

Truly the working classes and professional middle class of France—the latter especially—had been mocked by that phrase, "the fruits of victory." It had been a dead-sea fruit, bitter to the taste. The price of food-stuffs and all necessities of life were at least five times higher than at prewar rates. The clerk, the journalist, the salesman in a small shop, that vast multitude of men who in a civilized community have to eke out a respectable livelihood on fixed salaries, that do not depend on manual labor or provide opportunities of profit by commercial prosperity, found themselves pinched to the point of sharp distress.

Certain articles of food and living had risen in price like rockets, in Paris and other cities. Mutton, for instance, was fifteen and seventeen francs; ham, sixteen to eighteen francs a pound. A suit of clothes which cost a hundred francs in 1914 was not to be had from any tailor in 1921 for less than seven hundred francs.

justified by the production of employment was bound to ensue, and industrial enterprise.

In France, as in most other countries, the exasperation at high prices was such that some part of them, and the profiteering of unscrupulous speculators of the common people, and supported by corrupt influences in the government, clinging with the old claims of privilege, entrenched against the growing power of labor. I heard strange stories of vegetables left to rot in warehouses, while prices soared to fantastic heights in the market, great quantities of meat going to waste while small families were starving. The manufacturer was profiteering at the expense of the peasant, and the government was issuing figures of bankruptcy, by issuing paper money that had no reality. There was no work, and it did not make for economic



## THE PRICE OF VICTORY IN FRANCE

ants and villagers who returned to the long, broad belt of country which stretches across France like an open wound. A year after the war had finished I went back to that country to see new life where for more than four years I had seen a lot of death, and the reravaging of earth already ravaged by every kind of explosive gas force and poisonous gas. Nothing much had altered except that grass grew rankly on ground which was bare and barren when the guns had done with it. Many of the old trenches had silted in, and the shell holes which used to be six or eight feet deep were now filled up by the effect of rain, and the cemeteries—those little forests of our dead—were more neatly kept. In the general landscape there was not much difference, though as I looked closer I saw that the peasants had actually reclaimed many of these acres, especially around Peronne and south of the Somme, by digging out the chunks of steel that lay thick in the soil and searching for unexploded shells with a care that did not prevent many deaths. They had plowed the land, and furrowed it, and sowed some kind of crop, and their industry had gone on since then with untiring spirit, so that now a broader stretch of country is under cultivation.

I found little colonies of wooden huts, like the encampments of nomad folk, constructed at places like Passchendaele and Langemarck and Gheluvelt, where men of ours lived in dirty ditches from which they rose on days of battle to cross through a storm of fire, in which many fell, a score of yards or so, to where the enemy waited with machine guns, bombs, and trench mortars. In these wooden huts live the repatriated peasants who fled from the red tide of war, and I talked with many of them and heard the truth that was in them, and the passion, and the despair.

The point of view as expressed by those people who

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

had suffered and were suffering from the outrage of war is different from what one would hear from great people, and closer to the truth of life as it is seen in peasants' cottages and middle-class homes.

We know what the great people think, or, at least, say. I am sure M. Poincaré would have nothing new to tell me, if I sought the honor of an interview with him. Even M. Briand would only utter large generalities on the subject of future liberty, justice, and progress, and the necessity of maintaining the Entente Cordiale.

From old people in wooden huts on the edge of desert lands, from drivers of hired motor cars, from visitors who were soldiers, from little groups of people sitting round wooden tables in wayside inns, and from business men trying to "reconstruct" that which had been destroyed, I studied the popular psychology of France after the war, and found it interesting.

These people were great realists. They faced facts squarely and did not camouflage them by fanciful hopes or rose-colored romance.

Not even victory, and its pageantry, covered up by one grain of dust their realization of the immense horror of war and of its price in blood and ruin.

Military glory had no meaning to them except in stern duty and the endurance of abominable things which had to be endured.

It was a waiter who expressed a kind of rebuke to me one night, when he had been explaining the difference between a bronze star and a silver star and a palm on a military decoration. The first is for an act of valor "cited" to his regiment; the second "cited" (in the orders of the day) to the division; the third to the whole army throughout France.

He had the palm, and I said, "*Magnifique, ça!*"

He turned away for a moment with a queer, contemptuous grimace.

## THE PRICE OF VICTORY IN FRANCE

"Magnificent! Bah! . . . It is a reward for dirty work. Up to your knees in mud. Dead bodies everywhere. Stench, blood, fear, abomination. . . . It is better to be here, serving coffee and beer, and adding up little figures. It is a better job."

This man, and others like him, look back to the years of war with disgust, and not as a jolly adventure with good comradeship and good fun between the ugly hours, like some of our men. They did what they did because it was necessary to save France, but they hated it all.

And now they face the present and the future with, mostly, an unflinching sense of truth. Even those who have hope in the future, because of their own strength of character, do not disguise from themselves the slow rate of progress by which it will be possible to clear away all this ruin about them and rebuild.

"Twenty years," "thirty years," were the figures given by people in the devastated regions for the resurrection of their villages and farms.

They shrugged their shoulders at the word "reconstruction," used as a watchword by the newspapers and politicians, and said: "That is a fine phrase! . . . Meanwhile we have no material, no indemnities for our loss, no means of getting labor. The government does nothing. Perhaps it is powerless to do anything because of our drain of blood, this great devastation, and the poverty of all but the profiteers."

I had a strange little meal in a wooden shanty on the Somme battlefields, with a soldier, a farmer, and a commercial traveler.

In the next room was a wedding feast, and we were given what was left over, between each course, served by the wife of an English sergeant who had settled down in France after the war. We had to wait long, and filled up the gaps by conversation.

It was the commercial traveler who talked most,

rower. We are going down.

"We won the war," said the other, who had just climbed up to victory, in spite of the odds.

"We had people on each side of the Atlantic," he said, "the commercial traveler, the politician, the man that had propped up France, the Australian, the Canadian, the Armenian, and the chocolate man."

"As a nation we are going to be thrown down," he had our last fling—and we have now fallen into the pool. Our population is being thrown into the pool."

"Fortunately there are some people who are the health of the bride next to you," he said. "I am down, and always Germany. Financially, too, we are down. We are down in the United States."

"And England," said the other, "will gobble up more than he talked."

"That's true," said the other.

"How's that?" I asked.

The soldier hesitated. Then he spoke, saying frankly, "England is businesslike. Our weakness is our lack of business sense. She will continue to be a

## THE PRICE OF VICTORY IN FRANCE

the Paris papers, but in every local sheet in France, on the question of Syria and the "devotion of France to the self-determination of the Egyptian people." We were accused of hypocrisy for our policy in Egypt, and it was not good reading.

The commercial traveler began to talk about the elections.

"They are all faked," he said. "The French people do not govern themselves. They are governed by a swarm of professional politicians, who control the whole machine of bureaucracy, which is spread like a network over the whole of France—by swarms of little paid officials, who do nothing but draw their salaries.

"It has been like that before the war, and will be so after the war.

"A new party will come into power with fine words in its mouth. Do you think they will bring water to these devastated regions or build up destroyed villages? Oh, monsieur, you are an optimist!"

I found everywhere this contempt for politicians. France shrugs its shoulders at them all, and says: "It is a game! It has no reality."

They pin their faith to local initiative, individual energy, to build up on the ruins, yet are aghast at the enormity of the task.

Most of the individuals I met had suffered the loss of all their prewar possessions.

The driver of a motor car owned his own garage before the war. The government requisitioned his cars, sold them afterward for double the price he had given, but as yet he has recovered no indemnity, and is now a hired chauffeur.

The old woman who kept an inn on the Menin Road fled from it when the German shells came near, and was now back in a wooden shack. On the wall was a larger poster setting forth the claims for damage which



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

must be made to the government before a certain date. She had made them months ago, but had not touched a penny.

So it was in millions of cases, and there was exasperation, just or unjust, I know not, because there was no repayment out of the national treasury for losses incurred by the acts of war.

The lack of labor in France is serious, and made worse by the constant strikes for higher wages and by the high scale of wages now demanded by men who are not much inclined to work with their old industry, whatever their reward. They will work a little bit, and then take a holiday and enjoy themselves. They were in the mud of the war. They lived in trenches. They were surrounded with death. They escaped. . . . Shall they not enjoy life now, like the profiteers who did nothing but get rich?

So after the armistice the cafés were crowded. There were throngs outside the cinemas. In Lille, where conditions were very bad, they were not so bad that they stopped the fun of the fair or failed to crowd the circus where French clowns caused shouts of laughter, and strong men did prodigious feats, and Japanese wrestlers defied the laws of anatomy.

In a great tent there were four thousand people at least, under the glare of lights. I looked at their faces, intense, gaping, laughing at comic antics. They were soldiers and ex-soldiers with their wives and sweethearts. Every man there and every woman knew the tragedy of the war in their souls. They had been prisoners, many of them. They went through years of hell. Now they were shouting and screaming with laughter. It was their need in life. They must have laughter, light, shows, pleasure. They had come out of the darkness. Not even work must interfere too much with their vital need, which, in this afterwar psychology, was amusement.

## THE PRICE OF VICTORY IN FRANCE

But as one man told me, and I believed him, "if the people do not laugh they must weep, for truly victory has not brought much joy, but only a peace which is full of danger and a knowledge of a ruin which can only be repaired after many generations."

Cardinal Mercier's words that "Germany is already preparing a war of revenge which may come in fifteen years," struck a chill in the hearts of many people who read these words in local papers.

It is a terrifying idea—another war.

French peasants and the bourgeoisie regret that they could not crush Germany more. If only they had gone to Berlin!

The idea that there may be any comradeship of democracy between French workers and German workers, so preventing another war, is held only by international Socialists of the old type, who have many new adherents, but do not represent the majority of the working classes in France.

Many of them regard that as an illusion, and some of them as a treachery.

They shrug their shoulders at a gospel of brotherhood, and say "the Boche is a bandit, an assassin."

For England there is, in the north, where our troops were known and where they fought, a friendly and affectionate remembrance.

"*Nous avons un bon souvenir des soldats anglais,*" said an old peasant woman who had served many of them behind the lines, and such words were spoken by many others.

But that does not prevent a growing suspicion in the minds of many French people that England has got "all the fat," as they say, out of the peace terms, and that she has waxed fat herself out of the war.

It was no use telling them that we were spending two millions a day more than our income.

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

They say: "England is rich. England is enlarging her empire. England and America are masters of the world."

### IV

For some time there was, beneath the loud expression of joy in France because the victory was hers, a secret and sinister bitterness of revolutionary passion. Remember that when war broke out in 1914 the followers of Jean Jaurés, the Socialist leader, who was murdered on the first day (his murderer was acquitted at the end of the war), rallied to the flag of France with exalted patriotism. They said: "We are the enemies of war, but this was forced on us. This is the war to end war. By killing German militarism we shall destroy our own, for there will be no need of it. By defeating German tyranny we shall gain greater liberty ourselves. There will be a 'sacred union' of classes, and labor, which will save France, by its body and by its soul, shall get greater reward. Capitalism of the old evil kind will be dethroned, and capital and labor shall go hand in hand, not as enemies, but as friends and partners."

Over and over again I heard French soldiers say those things in the early days when all France was stirred by passionate enthusiasm and the spirit of sacrifice. . . . They left off saying them when the war settled down into trenches, when slaughter was piled up month after month, when it seemed unending, and when the *polius*, in those wet ditches, thought back to Paris, where the politicians and the rich seemed to be quite comfortable, making lots of money out of army contracts, and ready to go on fighting—by proxy—for years and years. What bitterness, what suspicion, what hatred of politicians and profiteers, was in the hearts of the French fighting men may be read in the books of Henri Barbusse; and I, myself, talking to those *polius*, in their

## THE PRICE OF VICTORY IN FRANCE

trenches and dugouts and in ruined villages behind the line, have heard all that passion of resentment. It seemed to these men—and seems to some of them now—that Jean Jaurés, their old leader, was right, after all, when he said that modern warfare was made to bolster up one set of capitalists against another set whose markets they coveted, or whose power they feared, and that the peoples who fought and died were not fighting altogether for their own liberties or for their own reward. After the war, when the French troops were demobilized and came back to the little homes, stinted of the barest necessities of life because of the rising prices, while French society of the well-to-do classes rioted in a mad kind of luxury during the peace negotiations, these men became even more bitter, and their spirit was menacing.

I went, one night in Paris, to a meeting of a society called *Clarté*. It was founded by the friends of that French author, Henri Barbusse, whose book, *Le Feu*, gives the most realistic and dreadful picture of the agonies and horrors of modern warfare, and contains the fiercest accusation of the evil elements in civilization which led up to the European war. *Clarté* means clearness—clarity—and the idea of the society is to bring together numbers of young men in France and other countries who went through the war and who are able to think clearly on the problems of life, the structure of society, and the means by which liberty, brotherhood, and peace may prevail over injustice, hatred, and the spirit of war. It was a night in August when I went to a back street in Paris and the rooms in which this meeting was being held. The rooms were so crowded that I could hardly push my way in, and so hot that one woman fainted, and sweat poured down the foreheads of French soldiers, and the whole company looked half stifled. It was a queer company, made up

rather sinister faces of a  
revolutionary gatherings in  
of Europe. With them we  
eyes staring moodily out of  
men with long, uncombed  
roving restlessly, and sullen  
wooden platform sat the sec  
man also, smartly dressed, d  
and with the sharp, self-c  
mercial traveler. He exp  
society and the progress he

Standing there at the back  
going limp in the heat, and  
about me making me feel s  
the program of *Clarté* for t  
was nothing more nor less th  
translated into French. It  
private property, the ruthles  
the control by the laboring  
and machinery of wealth, t  
national fellowship among  
Old stuff, the revolutionary "  
and the old call to violence.

## THE PRICE OF VICTORY IN FRANCE

with sun and wind as when I had seen them under steel helmets staring across No-Man's Land from their trenches and listening to the rush of shells which threatened them with death. I thought back to bitter words I had heard from their lips in those days, their words of scorn for politicians, profiteers, corrupt society, luxurious women, old men who gained by the death of youth. Out of that bitterness, unjust very often, overcharged with their resentment against the fate which had thrust them into the ditches of death, and now, inflamed by the thought of a poor reward for all their suffering, had come this spirit of revolt, this desire for sweeping and violent change, expressed in the subversive gospel of *Clarié*. . . . A dangerous crowd, yet not big enough in numbers, not representative enough of French mentality, to be any real menace to the security of the French government and state.

It was the young officer in the *Fouragère* who explained to me the meaning and purpose of the *Clarié* movement.

He spoke of the horrors of the war, and shrugged his shoulders, and said: "You know all about that. Let us not waste words on it. . . . Men who went through that business have come out changed, with new ideas. In the trenches they said, 'This must not happen again.' Then they went farther than that and said: 'To prevent this happening again we must alter the relations of people with one another, and kill all the old ideas which led to this massacre. Society must start afresh, on new lines, not marked out by frontiers of hatred. Working people of all classes must get together and recognize that they have common interests, to get on with their work in peace, without being flung against one another by people on top who make wealth out of them, or by their own passions, obedient to foolish old traditions.'"

He pointed to a few sentences in a manifesto of the

ing that had had  
close to the room in which  
of Reason, whose archp  
Reign of Terror. Were t  
in new phrases?

"The principles of a  
these young men of Frai  
and laughed when I hea  
"All great thinkers, all g  
religion have always agree  
is reasonable."

I heard other "axioms"  
to that strange little crowd

"Power ought to be com  
work, manual or intellect  
Speculation is a crime ag  
is a theft."

"Those who prepare for "

"It is thought which ha  
thought must lend their lif

"Those who do nothing a  
*quo.*"

A man by my side said,  
and I have heard these ide:

## THE PRICE OF VICTORY IN FRANCE

have talked about idealism, brotherhood of man, social contracts, the reign of Reason. The man by my side was, I should say, a mechanic, and something in his deep-set eyes told me that he had been through the realities of war.

"What do you think of it all?" I asked.

He laughed, not in a mocking way, but with a kind of shrug in his spirit. "Comrades of mine used to talk like that in the trenches, until they had their heads blown off. . . . There is some truth in it. Society is all wrong, somehow. We ought to build something better out of the ruin of the war. But human nature, monsieur, is greedy, cruel, and stupid in the mass. Ideals are at the mercy of low passions. Look at the world now—after the war! I see no approach to the brotherhood of man. We are beginning new hatreds, preparing perhaps for new wars, worse than the last."

"Then you don't believe in the movement of the *Clarté*?" I asked.

He shrugged his shoulders.

"It is playing in a literary way with revolutionary ideals which are at work among the masses. They will write articles; they will bring out a paper; they will hold conferences. The police will not interfere because they are men of letters. . . . But it is the high price of food and the falsity of German pledges which will move the masses. The war has left us with much trouble."

He shook hands with me and said, "American?"

"No, English."

He shook hands again.

"England, too, has her troubles, like all the world."

v

In spite of many currents of bitter thoughts in the minds of the French people, there is no spirit of revo-



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

lution in France, but rather an intense emotional desire for stable government, good leadership, economy, and reconstruction which will bring back prosperity and peace to France. So far from desiring to abolish private property, the French peasant, who is his own proprietor, the French shopkeeper and small tradesman, the clerk and professional man, the large merchant and the manufacturer, wish to increase the safeguards of property, to be more fully assured of the interest on money invested in government bonds, and to be repaid for all those loans which were made to Russia before and during the war. Their anger, their discontent, their utter disgust with the effects of the peace treaty are due to a sense of fear that their private property is not safeguarded and that they will get nothing out of victory to repay their losses.

All the foreign policy of France, all the irritation of the French people with those who were her friends, are due to their desperate anxiety to make their victory real, permanent, and profitable. France is haunted by the fear that her frontiers are no safer now than they were in 1914, in spite of all her immense sacrifice and losses and all her brilliant victories, and that she is not sure of peace itself for more than another spell of preparation for war. She realizes with dreadful misgivings that her population is declining steadily. In 1920 there were 220,000 more deaths than births, and in another twenty, thirty, or forty years the manpower of France will be terribly less in proportion to the Germans on the other side of her frontiers than it was in August of 1914. What if Germany recovers her wealth and strength? What if Germany, unrepentant and passionate for vengeance, allies herself with Russia, which has betrayed France and hates her? What if the German peoples, now split into smaller states, with Austria cut off from the supplies of life, regroup them-

## THE PRICE OF VICTORY IN FRANCE

selves and rearm themselves, in alliance with Russian Bolshevism, or a Russian autocracy that may follow Bolshevism? Dreadful, disturbing thoughts, that are in the brain of many French men and women not only in Ministerial chambers, but in city offices and shop parlors, and little rooms in apartment houses.

As far as Germany is concerned, France is determined to prevent her economic recovery at all costs, by the strict enforcement of the peace terms, which, if carried out to the letter, will strip her to the bone and keep her poor for at least a generation. However hard she works, the product of her toil will be seized to repay the damage of war in the Allied countries. Whatever her enterprise in other countries, the profits of her industrial genius will be taken if she does not pay to the full the bill which France and England, Italy and Belgium, and all the other countries whom she warred against have presented to her. If it is impossible for Germany to pay all those claims, or if she tries to dodge them, it is a sure thing that France will try to seize her future credits and keep her with her nose to the grindstone. If need be, France will seize the left bank of the Rhine, and if need be again, sit down in Berlin. That is the clear-cut, definite policy of France, coinciding with the sentiment of the people with regard to the Germans, and it is for that reason that they are perplexed, irritated, even exasperated with England, Italy, and the United States because they seem to see a different and conflicting point of view, a certain yielding weakness to the Germans, and actual acts of concession which seem to France a betrayal and a breach of friendship.

So it is with England's agreement with Germany not to seize the postwar values of German enterprise abroad in the event of her inability to pay the entire sum of indemnities by the times required. France is enraged with that concession, which weakens her power of keep-

discovery of some new cl  
tion needed by all the wo  
ably will, be the riches  
then, should we be in a  
immediate payment, basec  
her future wealth is incalc

Before the final present  
Germany, at the end of A,  
strain upon the friendly r  
Great Britain.

England's view was bas  
reasoning, which clashed v  
fundamental way. When  
mean the unofficial, instinct  
Englishman who looks at r  
in a business way. He sai  
less: "This idea of keeping  
ever, of holding her in th  
working for the rest of Eur  
her industry go to the pay  
generation

## THE PRICE OF VICTORY IN FRANCE

material and send us back manufactured goods in exchange. Italy needs that more than we do. Italy is in a bad way because Austria and Germany, her best markets, cannot pay for her produce. The United States want the German markets. All the world is hit because central Europe is paralyzed. But, apart from all that, which is common sense, the French policy is enormously dangerous. They think that Germany will submit to the position of a slave state. Germany won't. It is not in human nature. Certainly not in the human nature of a people sullen with defeat, remembering their strength and pride. If the pressure is made too severe, the punishment unbearable, Germany will either yield to anarchy and carry the disease of Bolshevism to the frontiers of France, or (which is much more likely) will form a close alliance with the inevitable autocracy of Russia under Lenin or some other, which will substitute a military regime for communistic theories, and then there will be another and more dreadful war which France will be too weak to resist. All civilization, as we know it, will go down, and we cannot afford to take that risk. We must not ask of Germany more than human nature will stand, and if possible we must make her a peaceful partner in some kind of a League of Nations, working with all of us for the regeneration of a stricken Europe."

To that argument the French replied with scorn and laughter, dubbing it the weakness of sentimental gibbering coupled with the treachery of forgetful friends.

The French Press, inspired by their Foreign Office, revealed a bellicose ardor which was deplored by that disillusioned, cynical, but wise old Frenchman, Anatole France, and a small minority of far-seeing men. Even some of the most radical papers, like the *Rappel*, clamored for the immediate occupation of the whole of Germany. The editor of the *Democratie Nouvelle*,

those words he abandon  
the Treaty of Versailles a  
sacred document. He  
view, deep seated in ever  
if the French were to take  
with its immense German  
another war would be co  
England would have to spe  
and all their remaining we  
for the next struggle. In  
papers of France there w  
Anglophobia, due to this  
editor of *L'Œuvre*, which u  
national, harked back to a n  
allied with violent attacks  
lie thick in the fields of Frar

All this stirring up of pa  
prelude to the political pro  
the British government b  
French Foreign Office, bel  
the German reparations. ]  
then Prime Minister of Fra  
as the representative of F  
in an inst"



## THE PRICE OF VICTORY IN FRANCE

two, and moved them toward the Ruhr, ready for an immediate advance. Speaking in the French Chamber on April 12, 1921, he put the case with brutal frankness and simplicity so that the Germans, and incidentally the British, might understand. "On the first of May Germany will find herself confronted with the statement of her obligations and how she has fulfilled them. We have a right to execution. The bailiff having been sent, the gendarmes must accompany him if the debtor persists in being recalcitrant. It is not a question of war; it is a question of pure justice." He intimated quite clearly that France was prepared to act alone. They had the arms. They were ready to use them.

It can hardly be doubted that Briand had the mass of his people behind him. Press propaganda, as well as years of disappointment with the peace, had created a sense of rage. Yet there were men and women in France who were not pleased at the sight of their boys leaving the plow again and putting on uniforms. It recalled too sharply the dreadful days of '14. Yet most of them said, "Perhaps it is the only way of getting our rights." Paris, always most inflammable, seemed in a set mood for a march on the Ruhr, whether the Germans agreed to pay or not. To capture the great German factories of Essen, the coal fields, arsenals, and industries, and hold them to ransom, seemed to them the best policy and the best business. It would keep Germany weak and drained. It would cut off fifteen million Germans from their Fatherland. It would provide much wealth at the expense of German labor. So the population talked over café tables.

### VII

Meanwhile, the experts were working feverishly at figures, reckoning out the resources of Germany, her

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

taxable capacity, the utmost burden she could bear. It is doubtful whether even the German experts had accurate figures before them. From a private source, well informed, I received information that all classes in Germany were evading internal and external taxation by hiding what wealth they had, transferring enormous sums into neutral countries, dodging income-tax returns, hoarding paper money, buying precious stones and objects of art of marketable value which do not appear in any available figures. On the other hand, the big German trusts, organized by Stinnes and other magnates, had been developing industry with enormous strides, and by the pooling of capital, raw material, and profits were paying high dividends to their shareholders. It was clear that the estimates on each side would never agree. The Paris settlement fixed five thousand millions as the cash value of Germany's obligations, with a twelve-per-cent levy on German exports. The payment spread over forty-two years at five per cent interest would total eleven thousand three hundred millions. The last German offer, represented as being the utmost they could pay, recognized a cash obligation of two thousand five hundred million pounds, reaching a total of ten thousand million pounds spread over an unstated number of years with interest. This last offer was transmitted to the United States of America with a plea of the arbitration of that country, the decision of which Germany pledged herself to accept. It was a last desperate attempt to split the Allies, for if the United States had accepted this offer and had abated the terms to Germany upon fair consideration, a storm of fury would have broken out in France which would have been dangerous to the peace of Europe. England's agreement with the United States, which would have been certain, would have led to the breaking of friendship with the French

## THE PRICE OF VICTORY IN FRANCE

people. President Harding and his advisers saw the danger of this trap, the utter impossibility of acceptance, and they notified very quickly to Germany, after cable communications with the French and British governments, that they did not regard the German offer as acceptable.

Historic meetings took place between Lloyd George and Briand, with Marshal Foch, Count Sforza, the Japanese ambassador, and others in attendance. The experts of the Reparations Commission now fixed six thousand six hundred million pounds as the total obligation in cash value to be accepted by Germany not later than May 1st. All the other clauses of the treaty respecting disarmament and the trial of war prisoners were to be strictly enforced.

The differences between the two Premiers were mainly limited to the question of "sanctions," the form of pressure, and the date by which Germany was to be compelled to pay. Briand, with Marshal Foch at his right hand, insisted that on May 1st the French armies should march into the Ruhr if Germany had not submitted. Lloyd George held out for a period of grace. Instinctively and intellectually the Prime Minister of England shrank from the thought of the occupation of the Ruhr. It seemed to him a policy of extreme danger. He did not need the private protests of a group of British bankers, and of Mr. Asquith, Lord Robert Cecil, and other statesmen (though their arguments enforced his own convictions) to feel profoundly that such an occupation would mean the "withering" of German industry so that the indemnity could never be paid, and the fatal assurance of a new war in the unknown but not distant future. Those arguments he placed before M. Briand with a certain touch of brutality which he can use at times with great effect, but they were countered by the burning resolve of Briand to



fall with a crash if the  
France and England will  
find some bridge of con-  
found. Six days' grace  
unconditional acceptance  
troops into the Ruhr—  
Lloyd George agreed to the  
ade of German ports if  
the terms. At the same  
was privately notified that  
the British government  
the spirit of the treaty  
German interests, as far  
as far as our honor was  
to Upper Silesia, coveted  
approval of the French.

The German government  
Wirth, accepted without  
the world, Lloyd George  
thankfulness. He made  
threatened seizure of the  
believe it possible that Ge  
sueded to some thing



## THE PRICE OF VICTORY IN FRANCE

work. And he foresaw the time when Germany, in alliance with Russia, would inevitably declare a war of vengeance if she were pressed to the limit of human patience.

Those views, held by the Prime Minister at least for a few days—though God alone could tell how quickly he would shift his ground or what undercurrents of political or other interests had impelled him in that direction—did, I think, represent the average opinion of the British people. They wished a fair deal to be given to Germany, if she agreed to pay up and made honest efforts to do so. They were afraid of an entry into the Ruhr, believing that it would guarantee a future war—and the idea of a future war was to them sickening and horrible and insane.

Aristide Briand departed from England in a state of gloomy exaltation. To the photographers on board his ship he said that nothing would give him greater pleasure than to see a film showing the British fleet steaming into Hamburg. It was the blurting out of his secret hope that the Germans would not accept, and that the "sanctions" would have to be applied. The fire eaters in France, and the passion of light-headed people, were disappointed by the German acceptance. It was received coldly, without thankfulness or enthusiasm. They disbelieved in the German promises to pay more than the first installments. It is certain that many of them disbelieved the German power to pay. What they wanted was the forcible possession of German industry and means of wealth, which they would ransom and then ruin as—do not let us forget that—Germany had ransomed and ruined the industry of Lille and other French cities in the time of war. There was hardly a Frenchman who could see that the ruin of German industry would mean the final downfall of the European trading system upon which all our

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

hope of recovered prosperity depends. France felt thwarted by her friends.

### VIII

The attitude of France toward Russia had been another cause of ill will and distress in French mentality. Russia's desertion of the Allied cause when revolution broke out and led to the peace of Brest-Litovsk was a frightful blow to France and to all of us. In the French mind there was no allowance made for the immense, bloody, and futile sacrifices of Russian soldiers, sent forward like sheep to the slaughter, badly equipped, often without arms and ammunition, against the flail of German machine guns and the storm of fire from German artillery. No allowance for the savage rage of the Russian masses against a corrupt, inefficient, and sometimes treacherous government, so that at least they cried out in despair and passion, "Our enemy is not in front of us, but behind us!"

One reason for the intense bitterness of the French against the Russians is easy to understand, and of immense importance to the individual Frenchman. Years before the war the French government had backed the issue of Russian bonds and had encouraged its people to subscribe to them. Every little shopkeeper, every bourgeois with a sum of money to invest, had bought Russian stock, which was the price and pledge of Russian military aid in the event of war with Germany. Now, with the Russian plunge into Bolshevism, all that money was jeopardized and probably irrecoverable. The thought worked like madness in the brains of the French middle classes. It dictated the policy of the French Foreign Office and French War Office, who supported every counter-revolutionary general, providing him with arms, ammunition, and money, in the

## THE PRICE OF VICTORY IN FRANCE

hope that the Lenin regime would be overthrown by a new dictator who would redeem the Russian bonds. Kolchak, Denikin, Wrangel in turn became the hope of France, and their successive disasters fell like icy waters on the spirit of the French people.

Yet it is profoundly significant that the soldiers of France, the men who had come out tired and resentful from the Great War, exhausted morally and mentally, would not engage themselves in any adventure on behalf of Russia which would lead to renewed fighting on their part. At the mere rumor that some of them were going to be sent to Russia, two regiments broke into something like mutiny. French policy was therefore directed to the urging on of other peoples against the Russian Bolsheviki and ardently encouraged Poland in her "offensive-defensive" warfare, which, after many setbacks and a retreat which looked like final disaster, rallied under French generalship and certainly inflicted on Trotzky's Red armies the most damaging defeat they had ever suffered. France would have no peace with Red Russia, and, though Europe was suffering hunger and dearth in many countries for lack of Russian trade and grain, France resented with exceeding wrath certain tentative proposals by England and the United States to arrange a commercial and political peace with the Russian people for the sake of the world's health and reconstruction, with the ulterior motive of overthrowing the Bolshevik devil by letting in the light to the victims of its bloody rule.

France has no faith in a League of Nations. Clemenceau shrugged his shoulders at the idea of it, and yielded to President Wilson's dream for the sake of practical support in the other items of the peace treaty. The French people will not admit their German enemies to any society of nations on terms of equality, and do not see any kind of guaranty in such a league for their

the old policy of the bal  
So with Belgium, with  
party in Hungary, with  
the slaughter of the Aus  
tablished secret understa  
and political, which will sa  
the menace of that tim  
recovered enough to be d:  
efforts of France that tim  
a logical, a clear-cut, in  
The only argument again  
the state of national ri  
jugglings, military engage  
cast a black spell over Eu  
that it is a preparation fo  
future time, when this ne  
tested in the scales of fat  
drenched in the blood of  
of this policy the French p  
last conflict was a war to  
German militarism was to  
burden of military service,  
standing army, and—in the  
to find someone

## THE PRICE OF VICTORY IN FRANCE

like their fathers, will one day be sent forward into the fires of hell to be torn to bits by flying steel, to be choked with poison gas, to be blinded, maimed, maddened, or killed. *Is it for that reason that just now there are not many mothers in France, not many babies being born?*

### IX

The soul of France is not happy nor at peace. Her agonies are too fresh, her wounds are still unhealed, and the price of victory has been too great. Whether one goes to the château of the landowner, or to the cottage of the peasant, or to the poor rooms of city needlewomen and workers, one is confronted instantly, four times out of five, with the ghost of some dead boy or man who haunts the living.

In the little wooden shanties which have been built up on the old battlefields I spoke, as I have told, to French people who have come back again. Several of them told me that their gladness was spoiled by the thought of the sons who would never help them in the fields again, or come tramping into the kitchen, or work for them in their old age.

One old woman said to me: "When peace came with its excitement which made us a little mad with joy I thought my son would come back. They told me he was killed, but I believed he would come back. Now I know he will not come back, and this work I do seems useless."

Other women spoke like that in some such words.

The men who have come back into these villages are not altogether merry. Some of them are rather sullen. There are quarrels between them and their women folk. For five years they were away from home, except for brief visits on leave, if they were lucky. During their absence their villages were the billeting places of

grateful to British soldiers  
in the war. They are  
the friendship they established.  
It is an aspect, and a truth  
which must not be left  
which has injured the  
nations who fought together.

England has suffered more  
for a time has been suspended  
her. Conscious that they  
suffered most damage—from  
age to beautiful towns;  
and countrysides—and the  
shocks of war, they believe  
from the peace. They praise  
of the British imperial rule  
tania, the German colonies  
that British policy now is  
selfishness, and that our  
of French interests and bar  
fruits of victory still an  
enemy.

## THE PRICE OF VICTORY IN FRANCE

agreed by the Supreme Council that the question as to the separation of Upper Silesia with its mixed population of Germans and Poles should be put to a plebiscite determining whether the whole, or part of it, should remain within the German *Reich* or go to Poland. The result of this plebiscite, superintended by an Allied commission under the protection of French and Italian troops, and a body of British officers, was by six to four in favor of Germany, though it was still within the right of the Supreme Council to decide the exact boundary line between Germany and Poland. Without waiting for that decision, Korfanty, a Polish leader, played the part of D'Annunzio in Fiume, aroused the fervor of the Polish masses, and incited them to occupy German districts. The French stood by without opposing their advance. The Italians resisted, and lost a number of men before they retreated under overwhelming numbers of Polish insurgents. British officers of the Allied mission, there to uphold international justice, in fairness to Germany as to Poland, found themselves in a powerless and humiliating position, surrounded by rebels against their authority whose officers they were compelled to salute.

When this news reached England, Lloyd George waited a little while and then gave tongue. He spoke raspingly, with something like violence, and the words had an ugly sound in the ears of France. In his first statement he did not mention France by more than a passing reference, but inveighed against Poland, the ally and foster-child of France, with very bitter words. The hardest thing he said was that her part in the war had been divided between those who fought by the side of Russia and broke when Russia broke, and those who fought to the end on the side of Germany against French and British troops. She owed her nationality to the Allies, and it was her duty to respect the Treaty



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

of Versailles which had created her as a nation. He made it plain that he would not tolerate this invasion of Silesia, and suggested that German troops might be given the authority to repel it.

A storm of protest and hostile comment arose the next morning in the French Press. Lloyd George was warned that his words were "dangerous," that France would not tolerate such insults to her ally, and that they revealed something like a pro-German spirit. Aristide Briand, the Prime Minister, accepted the fact that the Treaty of Versailles must be respected in Silesia as elsewhere, but warned Germany that any military adventure against the Polish insurgents would be regarded as an act of war by France. A few days passed, and it seemed as though the French Press had received orders to pour oil on the troubled waters. They made certain half-hearted apologies for the heat of their language and said that Mr. Lloyd George's statement had been inaccurately reported. There had been a "misunderstanding." But Lloyd George was resolved that there should be no misunderstanding of his views. On the evening of May 17th he issued another statement, more vigorous than the first, more provocative of French sentiment, not unjustified but challenging. To their Press he addressed severe and warning words: "In all respect, I would say to the French Press that their habit of treating every expression of Allied opinion which does not coincide with their own as impertinence, is fraught with mischief. That attitude of mind, if persisted in, will be fatal to any entente." In addition he used certain words which seemed to have a sinister meaning, suggestive of a new grouping of Powers in which France might be isolated from the friendship of Great Britain.

"The course of the world in coming years cannot be forecast. The mists ahead are more than usually

## THE PRICE OF VICTORY IN FRANCE

dense. Much will depend on the Allies holding together. Apart from the treaty obligations, events which cannot be foreseen *must determine the future groupings of nations, and the future of the world, especially of Europe, will be determined by old or new friendships.*"

That last sentence, if it had any meaning, and it was not uttered lightly, could have only one meaning, and that the warning that the Anglo-French entente might be broken in favor of an Anglo-German entente. As such it was taken by the French people, and it came to them as a blow in the face. In every newspaper in France this statement by the Prime Minister of England, following his first speech about Silesia, was regarded as an unfriendly, offensive, and brutal utterance, which they refused to accept as representative of the views of the English people.

They were right in refusing to accept that. In spite of the annoyance of many of our people at the long series of rather bitter articles appearing in French newspapers, the thought that our friendship with France should actually be endangered—broken—came as a sharp shock. The thought was abominable, for if that were to happen, if in the future groupings of nations we should find ourselves allied to the enemies of France and not with them, then indeed the whole of the Great War had been but a grisly massacre without any spiritual purpose at all, and the six hundred thousand British dead in the fields of France had been slain for the devil's jest in a game of mockery.

We must have differences with France. Our general attitude toward the foundations of peace in Europe was not the same as hers, because her peril was greater, her sense of unforgivable injury more poignant, her future more uncertain, her desire to keep Germany weak and poor a desperate and all-consuming passion, because of hideous memories and ever-present fears.

remember at the begi  
"Vive les Anglais!" w  
marching through Fren  
and women who thru  
hands; the cry of "Ca  
troops in the villages b  
where every Tommy h  
he went off to battle a  
death. . . . I remembe  
the end of it all, when t  
wept with joy at the si  
wiped out, forgotten, a  
politicians and a drifting  
are men alive in Englar  
will remember the hero  
long, patient suffering, t  
of tragedy, their valor  
remember our men, the  
graves they tend still wit

To me, now and alway  
future with a vision impc  
name of France is like an  
her history, her beauty,  
I am not alone in the

## VI

### THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN ENGLISH LIFE

#### I

**I**N many subtle ways, not apparent on the surface of things, the social spirit of England has been more changed in the last six years of history than in the six centuries preceding them. Such a statement may seem fantastic in exaggeration for the sake of an easy and arresting phrase, yet it is exactly true of certain characteristics of English life and habit, for the war was a convulsion which shook England to the core and broke up many of its old instincts and traditions of social faith.

In spite of the modern developments of democracy and industry, the progress of education, and the growth of cities, England remained, until the World War, amazingly feudal in its structure and insular in its habits of thought. The old landed aristocracy maintained in the countryside the power and allegiance which they had possessed for hundreds of years, and the small farmers and tenantry, fast rooted to their soil, had no sense of change and no desire for change.

In counties like Somerset and Devon, Warwick and Gloucester, Norfolk and Suffolk, the peasant laborer was, in his ways of speech and thought, but little different from his forefathers of Tudor and Plantagenet times, spoke almost the language of Chaucer, so that to the London man, modernized, quick witted, the

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

“yokel” of the south, west, and north was incomprehensible in his dialect and primitive in his outlook and understanding. The landed gentry, in old country mansions, changed the cut of their clothes, danced the fox-trot, adopted the latest social fashion, but instinctively, in the very fiber of their bodies, in allegiance to a tradition of life and to a certain plot of land which was theirs, were intensely insular.

I remember a year or two before the war a startling instance of the conservatism of English life beyond the cities. It was when the craze for “pageants” had caught hold of English imagination, so that in many old towns the people dressed themselves in the costumes of the past, reread the history of their forefathers, and acted the drama of the centuries from Saxon times to their own present. In Norfolk there was such a pageant, and one scene of it was to represent a chapter of history when, five hundred years ago, the gentlemen of Norfolk, with their squires, came to pay homage to Mary Tudor, their princess. Five centuries had passed, but every actor in the scene bore the same name, lived on the same soil, held the same place, as those ancestors of his who had knelt before the Tudor princess.

In a thousand ways like this England held to the past. The people were insular, and the sea which divided them from the Continent was a great water of defense against the spirit of change, except in outward, superficial things.

Then the war came and changed much in the spirit of English people. . . . At first it seemed as though it would be like other wars of England—a foreign expedition of a little professional army, and of young lads eager to see “foreign parts” by taking the king’s shilling. They would fight gallantly, many would be killed, there would be exciting reading in the newspapers, and then the bells would ring for victory, the

## THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN ENGLISH LIFE

lads would come marching back, and English life would go on again, hardly touched or altered. Even at Waterloo there had been only twenty-five thousand English soldiers. To the mass of English folk the Napoleonic wars had been a remote and distant thing, not affecting their own lives much. When the great World War broke out the British troops who were sent, according to the pledge with France, were called the "Expeditionary Force," as in the old days. But presently the Regular Army was spent, and presently all the youth of the nation was sent out, the younger brothers following the elder brothers, the married following the single men, fathers of families conscripted like the boys at school. England was all in—all her men, all her women, and no escape for any of them in the service of death. No living body in England was exempt from the menace of destruction. Death came out of the skies and chose old men and women, nursing mothers, babies, anyone. The enemy attacked them in little homes in back streets, in big factory centers, in the heart of London. . . . So England was no longer safe in her island. An island people, uninvaded for a thousand years, with utter reliance on her fleet as an invincible shield, were suddenly shocked into the knowledge that the sea about them was no longer an impassable gulf between them and all foreign foes. It was a shock which broke up the old psychology. We have not recovered from it yet, nor ever shall do.

English youths went out to the death fields, hundred thousand after hundred thousand, until four million men had gone that way. From first to last on all fronts, the men of the English counties—not Irish nor Scots, nor Welsh nor Canadian nor Australian—made up sixty-four per cent of the British fighting forces. They were English soldiers who fought most, and endured most, and died most, because there were most of them,

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

though the world heard least of them, because the English people don't talk most about themselves. Out of every four men who went out to the World War one did not come back again, and of those who came back many are maimed and blind and some are mad. England and the spirit and mind of England were altered by so great an ordeal which had come to every home and heart.

### II

In many ways the alteration was plainly visible during the war, especially to fighting men who came home from the dirty ditches on three days' leave, or seven. The home-staying people—the old and middle-aged, the workers in the factories providing the material and munitions of war, the government officials, clerks, and employers of labor, even the young girls—were possessed by a new energy, a more vital spirit, a restless and energetic excitement. They were all “out to win.” They were all, in big ways or little, dynamic in their activities. Caste was for a time in abeyance, though not abolished. (That in England, where we are all snobs, from the plumber's mate and the greengrocer's wife to the Eton boy and the dowager duchess, would be expecting too much, too quickly.) University professors were acting as field laborers. Patrician women were making munitions with factory girls. A great, strong, spiritual wind seemed to have swept through all classes of English life. It had cleansed even the slums of great English cities which had seemed past cleansing.

Before the war, an immense population in England crowded into the cities, had lived below the poverty line or on the thin edge of it—miserably, precariously, dirtily. There was a mass of floating, casual labor, often out of work, huddled in the hovels of back streets,

## THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN ENGLISH LIFE

filthy conditions. Their children were ragged, unfooted, underfed. Now those conditions had been altered by the war. The demand for labor was so great that every able-bodied man could get a good wage. The government and the employers paid great wages for skilled work. Mechanics who had found trouble in getting forty or fifty shillings a week now gained two hundred or three hundred shillings a week. Any girl with her hair hanging down her back or tied to a pigtail could get a wage that her father would have envied before the war. Munition girls were getting three or four pounds a week, some of them far more than that. Small families, all working, paid by government money, raked in an incredible weekly revenue. For the first time they had a broad margin of money for the fun of life as well as for its sharp necessities.

I remember being home on leave once during the war and walking in the park of a poor district of London on bank holiday—when the poor people used to come out of their slums in their rags to enjoy a little liberty. This time there were no rags, but well-dressed children, girls overdressed in the imitation of fashionable ladies, a strange new look of prosperity and well-being. At that time the workers in factory towns had more money than they knew how to use, and bought absurd little luxuries, and grabbed at the amusements of life without thought of the morrow. There were pianos in the homes of coal heavers, and the wives of laborers wore fur coats—in summer as well as in winter.

The fighting man, back from the trenches, where he risked death every day and every minute of every day for one shilling and twopence, was startled by the money made by the luckier men who worked for war at home. He saw injustice there, inequality of service and reward, and sometimes was bitter and blasphemous on the subject. But on the whole, the soldier did not



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

begrudge the money earned by the home workers. They were his folks. He was glad of their luck, though he did not share it. He believed that when he came home—*if* he came home!—he, too, would get high wages for any job he might get. His wrath and the wrath of the home workers (in spite of their own prosperity) were reserved for the manufacturers and financiers who were making enormous profits out of government contracts—vast profits out of the massacre.

“The profiteers,” as they were called, sometimes fairly and sometimes unfairly, became the worst hated class in England as in other countries, by the masses of working people, and by the old gentry who gave their youth to war, according to old traditions and the law of their caste, without any reward but that of pride and honor. The old aristocracy saw themselves doomed by the uprising of the New Rich. The small landowner, the country squire, the nobleman of the old order, aloof from trade and manufactures, gave their wealth to the service of the state, as they gave their sons, and upon them fell, year by year, a heavier burden of taxation. Before the end of the war, and after the end of it, many of them sold their estates, which had been in their families for hundreds of years, sold also their family treasures. The New Rich took possession of many old mansions, bought the family heirlooms of the old regime, renovated and vulgarized old historic places. I know one family of the ancient order whose history in the war is typical of others. There were four sons, and all of them were in the army or the navy, and two of them were killed. The daughters became nurses and devoted themselves to the wounded during all the years of war. The mother died by the strain of war. Increasing taxation bore down heavily upon an already impoverished estate. The father, a peer whose name belongs to the great memories of Eng-



## THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN ENGLISH LIFE

land, sold the pictures of his ancestors to an American millionaire, then the treasures and relics of his house. It is now an empty shell, and the eldest son, back from the war, farms a little plot of land on the edge of the old park which belonged to the family since the first Charles was king.

### III

A social revolution has been accomplished in England by this turn in the wheel of fortune. The New Poor—once the old gentry—are scraping along fairly well, as they must confess, on the remnants of former wealth; the New Rich possess many of their places, and so far have not learned those traditions of kindness, of generosity, and of noble manners which made the old gentry pleasant people, whatever faults they had. In a way previously unknown to a great extent in England, small traders, little manufacturers, business adventurers, without capital or power, seized the chance of war, the needs of a government reckless of all cost provided the supplies of war came in, and made rapid progress to great prosperity. Their profits mounted higher and higher, and, though the government imposed upon them an excess-profits duty, most of them dodged it, in one way or another.

From this class there has risen up a new "smart set" whose appearance and ways are surprising to those who knew England before the war and came back with observant eyes. They have invaded the places which used to be sanctuaries of the old aristocracy—Prince's restaurant, the Hyde Park Hotel, the royal inclosure at Ascot, the lawns of Ranelagh and Hurlingham, the river gardens of Henley. They dress loudly and talk loudly, in a nasal way. The young men are singularly lacking in good manners. They sprawl in the presence of their women folk. Their idea of gallantry is horse-

... seems, to a  
which they perform earn  
in life, but as far as I ha  
get any real pleasure ou  
company of the girls. I  
another as they would c  
to the City. The girls  
set, are a curious comp  
and tomboy simplicity.  
hideous little frocks and  
will drive a motor car  
without turning a hair,  
"cheek" gets too much  
self-possessed, bad-manne  
premeditatedly indifferent to pub  
the sensibilities of old-fash  
ous in the larger moraliti  
are able to look after them  
though they take risks wh  
of their grandmothers, and  
which would arouse the su  
ble. Those young people  
did well out of the war.  
the refinements of wealth

## THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN ENGLISH LIFE

It was the middle-class man or woman that was hardest hit by taxation before the ending of the war, and by the prices of life's necessities rising higher and higher every month. The laboring classes kept mostly beyond the pace of these rising prices by rising wages. Well organized and fully aware of their new importance as the workers for victory, they saw to it that their wages should always be on the upgrade and beyond the tide of living costs. If this did not happen, they went on strike, and the government yielded—every time. The government paid every kind of wage for work, though secretly it knew that there would be a fearful reckoning when victory was assured, if it might be assured, which was not always certain. But there were many people between the devil and the deep sea—between profiteers and organized labor. They were unorganized. They were living on the interest of small capital. They were dependent on fixed salaries or professional fees which could not be increased. Their rents were raised. The income-tax assessor had no mercy on them. The cost of living frightened them. They were reduced to a state of stinting and scraping, underfeeding, clinging to shabby clothes. They, more than any, belonged to the New Poor. . . . Then at last the war ended, and masses of men came back from the battlefields, leaving an Army of Ghosts behind them—their dead comrades. Then all things changed under the surface of English life.

### IV

The men who came back were not the same men as those who had gone away. They had been utterly changed. They had gone out from villages in England where their life had been very narrow, very limited in means and speech. Many of the boys in those villages

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

were as simple and unthinking as the peasants of the Middle Ages. From the city slums they had gone out in the big battalions, and the under-sized, under-fed, ill-aired lads of that city had been broadened and strengthened, well fed, well aired in an outdoor life that was healthy and fine when it was not deadly and dreadful. They had taken frightful risks as a daily habit, until the thought of death was not much to them. They had mixed and talked with men of many minds. They had thought strange thoughts in the silence of night watches with the instant menace of death about them. Some of them were broken in nerve. Some of them were brutalized and demoralized by this life of war. Many of them were bitter and resentful of the things they had had to do and suffer and see. All of them hated war. Most of them had come to think that not only the Germans were guilty of that war, though most guilty, but that something was wrong with civilization itself, with the governments of nations, with the old men who had sent the young men to the trenches because this massacre had been arranged or allowed.

They were eager to get back home, and thousands were kept rotting in mind and body in many far places—as far as Mesopotamia—months after peace. When they came home they were not eager at first to get to work. They had earned, they thought, a holiday, a long rest. They had served England. England could keep them for a bit. So for many months they idled, played around, restlessly, never quite satisfied, not fitting easily again into civil life and home life—and the government still kept them on unemployed doles, piling up the national debt, printing more paper money, which was nothing but a promissory note on future industry. Prices did not fall; they rose higher. The profiteers, big and small, capitalist and shopkeeper,

## THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN ENGLISH LIFE

still demanded the same margin of profit on goods made and sold. The ex-soldier was exasperated by these prices. His government dole was not large enough to give him much of a margin for the fun of life. Presently he began to demand work. The mass of skilled hands found it easily enough, on the whole, and at war wages. But there was a great mass of unskilled labor which could not get work. It was very skilled labor in the art and craft of war. It was made up of expert machine gunners, experienced airmen, riflemen, bombers, trench-mortar experts, fellows who could use a bayonet dexterously. But it was utterly unskilled in the arts and crafts of peace. These men had been boys when they were recruits. They had gone out to war straight from school. They had skipped apprenticeship to any trade. They had not even learned typewriting or clerical work. When they asked for jobs the trade-unions said:

"Where is your apprenticeship ticket?"

"I was in the army," said the unemployed man. "I was fighting for England and the whole damn crowd of stay-at-homes."

"Sorry," said the trade-union foreman. "You were little heroes, no doubt, and we're much obliged to you, but we don't dilute skilled labor with unskilled trash. It's against trade-union rules."

It was also, it seemed, against the principles of many employers of labor in the great cities, the managers of city offices. Young gentlemen who had been officers in the infantry or the aircraft, in the tanks or machine-gun corps, called upon them in search of clerkships. These were the loyal gentlemen who, while the young men were fighting and dying, said, "We will fight to the last man—to the bitter end." But now that the end had come, with victory, some of them looked doubtfully at the ex-officer boys who had had the luck to come back, and uttered disconcerting words.

sincerity in their hearts.

On Christmas Eve last  
were filled with people doing  
these ex-officers—heroes  
sidewalks, turning the hand  
ing to the charity of passing  
the worst and not the best  
the scallywags, but it was  
sight of them there sickened  
with them in the war. I  
who was reduced to hawking  
to house. By an irony of the  
Great War, in which he had  
On the sales of the book he was  
but at the end of his first  
agonized with shyness and  
“lady of the house” lest she  
he had taken tea in better  
on his expenses. There are  
are friends of mine—who have  
decent job since the armistice  
for them, in spite of Lord  
to the nation on their behalf  
chance than their own.

## THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN ENGLISH LIFE

The government was not unmindful of these men. Every unemployed soldier received, and still receives, a weekly allowance, now reduced to one pound, and this helps a single man to scrape along without starvation, but no more than that, and without any sense of good reward. The man who doesn't like work makes it do. The man who wants to work and can't receives this dole without gratitude—with a curse in his heart at a nation's ingratitude.

Among his rivals, keeping him out of work, were the girls of England. During the years when manhood was away in masses the girls came out of their homes, took the places of men in many kinds of work—rough work as well as soft work—and did wonderfully well. They were happy in that work, earning good wages which enabled them to buy pretty frocks, to amuse themselves in holiday hours, to be magnificently independent of the stuffy little homes in which they had been like caged birds. English girlhood found its wings in the war, and flew away from the old traditions of inclosure to a larger liberty.

That has been an immense social change. Apart from the peculiarities of the New Rich which I have mentioned, it has changed the manners and spirit of English life, and these clear-eyed girls of war-time England, now grown to womanhood, have nothing in common with the prim and timid ways of their mammas and grandmammas, but face life without shyness of fear—confident, frank, adventurous, out for fun at any price—which is sometimes too high and horrible.

Since the war a new generation of youth—boys as well as girls—has grown up. The younger brothers are filling the places of the elder brothers who were in the fighting fields and did not come back. It is a new kind of youth in England, belonging to a new life strange to us older men. It is not touched by the shadow of



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

war. It has got clear away from that. It refuses to be gloomy with present conditions; it is impatient of the tragedy that hangs over older minds. It is very daring in its desire to cut clean away from old traditions of thought and manner. It is joyous, reckless, amazingly thoughtless of trouble ahead. It joins the dance of life, eager to crowd a lot into the passing hour. The lessons and the memories of war do not seem to sober it or touch it with any gravity.

### v

It seems to superficial observers, even sometimes to men like myself, whose job it is to observe below the surface, that the English people have forgotten too quickly the things that happened—the men who died, the men who live in blindness, in madness, in hospitals for cripples and shell-shock cases. Many times I have been saddened by this thought of quick forgetfulness and have been startled by the apparent callousness of my own country after the blood sacrifice of its youth.

England is not callous. A great proof of piety and remembrance and pride was given on the last anniversary of armistice, when the body of an unknown soldier was brought down Whitehall, past the Cenotaph, on the way to a grave in the Abbey. The King and his generals waited there to salute this body of a man whom no one knew except as one of those who had fallen in the defense of England, whom no one knew, yet was known in the hearts of all of us. In the night women came out into the streets of London to wait for the dawn, to be ready for the man who was *their* man—husband or lover or brother or son. Not thousands of women, but hundreds of thousands. Men, too, mostly ex-soldiers, came to welcome back a pal who had died out there in that great comradeship of death. To each

## THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN ENGLISH LIFE

woman the unknown soldier was her man; to each soldier his pal. There were few tears in the crowd when the coffin came, with an old tin hat and gas mask on the flag which draped it. No tears, but a wonderful silence and the spirit of remembrance. And when the coffin passed, led by the King and his generals, there was an endless line of folk passing by the Cenotaph to lay little bunches of flowers on the pedestal of that empty shrine. All through the days and nights for a week of days and nights, never stopping, never speaking, a living tide flowed by, paying the homage of their souls to the dead, and for more than a week of days and nights they passed into the Abbey, to walk by the grave of the unknown soldier who was theirs. The soul of England remembers.

But her people hide their wounds, and foreigners who go to England are startled to find so little trace of war's scars. They see the streets thronged by cheerful people, well dressed, well fed, prosperous looking. "England has recovered marvelously," they say. "She has returned to normal. She is the same old England."

That is untrue. There will never be the same old England again. It is a new and different England. Not yet has the country recovered from the drains of war, nor paid the price of victory.

### VI

For a long time England was the great, rich, strong country of the Allies. In the early years of war English gold, all the savings of centuries, was the Fortunatus's purse of other fighting nations. We supplied France, Italy, Russia, Greece with money and materials of war. They borrowed and borrowed from us. Then our wealth was exhausted and it was our turn to borrow, from a nation richer than we had been. At the present

deeper and deeper the. g  
future in order to make pi  
of carrying on the country  
was before the war, owing to  
thing that is essential to the  
or to the ambitions and pi  
After "the war to end war  
two hundred and seventy mill  
is much more than twice as  
budget for all the purposes of  
On our military and adminis  
potamia the government spen  
year, until the pressure of p  
curtail this cost, which served  
"boost" up the oil sharks.

The interest on our nation:  
hundred and forty-five million  
times as much as the prewar a  
this revenue the English foll  
patience and endurance. Th  
taxation. Capital is squeeze  
and the profiteer is outrage  
wealth. But all employers  
hit hard—bludged—h--

## THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN ENGLISH LIFE

income in taxation. At the beginning of 1921, when economic realities were faced for the first time, money was so "tight" in England that the banks refused further loans to commercial and industrial companies, and many manufacturers found it impossible to "carry on." They were in a tragic dilemma. The markets of central Europe, Russia, and Asia had collapsed. Those were unable to buy either manufactured goods or raw material on any scale sufficient to sustain the old prosperity of English factories. At the same time labor in England refused to lower its scale of wages to anything like the prewar level, or, indeed, at all, the consequence being that the cost of production remained too high for competition in any foreign markets, and the retail prices in England were not falling, and could not fall, to their old level. Capital itself was nervous of "cutting its losses" by wholesale reductions in prices, and decided to challenge the whole position of labor by declaring a lockout, closing down factories, and biding its time until the rising tide of unemployment—a tidal wave—brought the workingmen to their senses. Unless they reduced their wage claims England would soon be threatened with bankruptcy.

### VII

The first round in the great struggle was fought out with the coal miners. They had for a long time been a privileged class of labor, earning high wages during the war, yet never satisfied, even at the time of their prosperity, owing to certain inequalities of conditions and rewards in the various coal fields. Influenced by local leaders, many of them men of fine character and brain power, and by agitators of a low, revolutionary, tub-thumping kind, they were deeply suspicious of the owners, whose profits seemed to them out of all propor-

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

tion with that of labor. They could see no reason why men like the Duke of Northumberland or women like Viscountess Rhondda, by a mere accident of birth which put them in one cradle rather than another, should get royalties on all the mineral beneath their inherited land, without doing a hand's turn of work to improve the machinery or management of the mines. For some time the idea of nationalization appealed to them as the Magna Charta of the mine industry. If all mines were worked by the government, their inequalities of service and reward could be adjusted, and a greater common wage could be secured for the workers. This question was forced to the front after repeated strikes, especially in South Wales, the storm center, and at last the government under Lloyd George appointed a commission to inquire into the whole problem of the coal industry, with a pledge that they would not refuse the report of the majority on the commission under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Sankey. After many sittings of a dramatic character in which ducal coal owners and others were subjected to keen cross-examination by the miners' representatives, and made but a poor showing, as most people admitted, in defense of their hereditary privileges and their amazing ignorance of their own source of wealth, the Sankey report was issued and was in favor of nationalization. The miners naturally demanded the fulfillment of the government pledges to act upon its findings, and when a year passed and it became plain that the government had no intention whatever of doing so, the word "betrayal" was used from Cardiff to Newcastle by millions of men. From that time their confidence in the government was destroyed. They had "no use" for Lloyd George, who once had been their hero. In 1920, when the export of coal to foreign countries was still a source of great profit, owing to exorbitant rates charged to foreign countries,

## THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN ENGLISH LIFE

the miners tried their strength by striking for a bigger share of those profits. To win the favor of public opinion, they also demanded that fourteen shillings and sixpence a ton should be taken off the price to home consumers. They were beaten on both issues, and surrendered temporarily, not without anger and smoldering discontent.

Then in the spring of 1921 the government flung a bombshell into the coal industry by an abrupt abandonment of "control." Throughout the war and for two and a half years afterward the government had "controlled" the industry by an arrangement with the owners by which they received a certain share of profit in return for subsidizing the cost of production in order to maintain the men's wages at the level agreed upon from time to time. It had been officially announced that the government control would continue until August, but without warning the date was altered to March. Again the miners used the word "betrayal," and even some of the mine owners protested against the alteration. What had happened to alter the government plans was a sudden icy blast of fear on the subject of national finance. Expert advisers warned the Cabinet that if their policy of expenditure, at home and abroad, were continued much longer, the bottom would fall out of the Treasury. The millions of pounds spent on pensions, doles, and subsidies, to say nothing of imperial expenditure, could not be balanced by income from the national industry, which was showing signs of rapid decline. The burden of taxation on capital was crippling all enterprise and development. Employers of labor were shutting down their works on all sides, and our export trade suddenly "slumped" to an alarming degree. Coal exports above all dropped with a rush for lack of orders. France, Italy, and other countries which had been forced to pay our high prices in their

longer possible in respect  
was then that the government  
handed back the mines in  
tion that they must maintain  
Between mine owners, managers  
there were a few whispering  
eyelids, a nod of assent.  
to heel. A drastic cut in  
fight, but now is the time  
It was done in the worst  
gravest risk. It was the  
It is hardly to be denied  
some knowledge of human  
very near to revolution in  
crisis in the spring of 1917  
few men were between them  
If ten o'clock had struck  
April, without a repeal of the  
transport men, there would  
class warfare leading to blood  
the wildest kind.  
That was not in any way  
their allies desired revolution  
are set in motion

## THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN ENGLISH LIFE

spiracy against them on the part of the employers of labor and the government to force them to the acceptance of wages below the level of decent livelihood and to smash the power of their labor organization by which they had obtained protection and a decent wage rate after centuries of struggle. On the other side was the government supported by the aristocracy and middle class (from whom they were recruiting a powerful Defense Force) believing with equal sincerity, and more fear, that the general strike was a revolutionary blow at the life of the nation, and a deliberate menace to all constitutional authority which must be defended by all available force. If that is not setting the lists for an ordeal by battle between two great classes then history is a mockery of fact.

It is not difficult to tell what would have happened. I have seen strikes in England before, and in other countries, localized and trivial in comparison with this one menaced, which give me a fair idea of the larger scale. The members of all the trades in the Triple Alliance would have been divided. Many of the railway men and transport workers would have refused to obey the strike orders. It was for that reason that J. H. Thomas withdrew them. But this division among the men themselves would have led inevitably to passion and violence with the cry of "Scabs" and "Blacklegs." The government, with crowds of volunteers from the middle class and the ranks of the nonstrikers, would have carried out an effective service for the *elementary* necessities of national life—not more than that. This success would have still further embittered millions of men, standing idle, loafing about goods yards and station entrances, congregating in mobs around fire-eating orators, among whom would have been the revolutionary fanatics, the communists ready for social destruction at all costs, and the usual minority of young



shooting into unarmed  
that sequence of events  
Then the fury of mobs  
“the butchery of the pe  
ance. Among the Defen  
as they were already calle  
group—there were great  
of laborers glad to get  
because they had been o  
kill their own class. . . .  
no farther. It might ha  
England, of all Great Bri  
down.

Now what brought Eng  
so near, so horribly near  
same as in most conflicts  
which no victory may be  
ruin. Sheer stupidity an  
clear that there was astoni  
and something of the other

To take the governmen  
They showed an immens  
ignorance of ordinary psyc  
ation to come to the

## THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN ENGLISH LIFE

Did they think the miners would accept the new conditions, so paralyzing to their standard of living during the period of subsidized prosperity, without a desperate struggle which would inevitably cost the nation more than a transitional period of financial aid? The cost of the Defense Force was nearly a million pounds a week, out of the pockets of the taxpayers. The loss in coal output and trade was many millions a week—far more than a decreasing scale of assistance which would tide over the time of “slump,” while wages were being readjusted gradually.

And the mine owners—did they believe when they issued the lockout notices and flung the new scale of wages at the miners, with a “take it” or “leave it,” that those men would say: “How good and kind you are, dear gentlemen! Of course we will work for wages which will reduce a million of us to the old standards of sweated industries, because we love our country so much!” The mine owners knew perfectly well that the men would reject this new scale utterly. They knew, and they have afterward admitted, under pressure, that the proposed wage “cuts” were excessively severe, unreasonable, and unacceptable, to such an extent that afterward they were forced to revise them substantially in favor of the poorer classes of mine labor.

Why this admission after the conflict had begun? Why not have put reasonable, instead of unreasonable, proposals before the miners and the public, some months before the lockout notices were posted, so that all would have had full warning and time for discussion, negotiation, and compromise while the pits were still working? It is the curse of our national life that these industrial troubles are conducted on lines of warfare between capital and labor—secret mobilizing, a sudden ultimatum, wild and whirling appeals to prejudice by the propaganda departments, then clearing

that is the guilt of the r  
connivance of the governn

The miners were equally  
one particular, criminal  
right in rejecting terms w  
least a million of them to v  
line of bare necessity, wa  
the case of South Wales  
forty-nine and a half per c  
11d. per week, reckoned in  
at 1914 prices—a slave w  
alienating the vast majority  
to wreck the mines, their ov  
industry of the country it  
the safety men and violen  
It is true that the mine c  
notices to the pump men as  
for the trouble that came, l  
made themselves guardians  
according to the elementary  
a quality of spirit nobler tha

The Triple Alliance conc  
its strategy with a staggeri



## THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN ENGLISH LIFE

of their men to the call for a general strike. They knew that such a strike would develop into a class warfare in which their own members would be divided against each other. . . . It is to the credit of J. H. Thomas and some others that in the end they forced the extremists to look at the stark realities of the ruin they faced instead of mouthing passionate nonsense and leading broken battalions to disaster.

The cross-examination of the mine owners and of Frank Hodges, the miners' young leader, in a committee room of the House of Commons by a crowd of members, inspired at last by the gravity of national danger to act like respectable men instead of like a flock of sheep under the discipline of the Welsh shepherd, was one of the most dramatic episodes in English history, and did something to restore the position and independence of the private members which had been utterly lost. It revealed facts which had been concealed by the vague generalities of challenge and counter-challenge. It tore out the falsity of propaganda from the case of the mine owners, dragged admissions from them about the injustice of the new wage proposals. From Frank Hodges it produced the possibility of concessions from the points of pride and passion, and made new negotiations possible, giving J. H. Thomas his chance of escape from "direct action" and the suicide of the General Strike.

The second breakdown of negotiations between the miners, owners, and government produced a reaction of public sympathy against the miners, who had won a good deal of sympathy by the earlier presentation of their case. The offer of a temporary subsidy of ten millions of pounds from the government seemed a generous departure from the rigid principle they had laid down, and the miners' renewed insistence upon a national pool seemed to superficial minds, especially to

care and understanding t  
born on the point that wi  
pool, regulating district wa  
of equality in earnings be  
as hard in places of poorer  
one might disagree with  
general principles related  
not "political" in its arg  
to understand the stubborn  
to enter even into a discus  
were partisans, unconscio  
mine owners.

v.

One thing was made clea  
which in a few weeks inflic  
able damage upon the main  
produced widespread unen  
soon be remedied, and startl  
of social strife in this cou  
were looking for our leade  
is the urgent, desperate nee  
standing and self-sacrifice  
ploved for the sake of

## THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN ENGLISH LIFE

led to realize that they must guarantee a decent living wage and reduce their standards and hopes of profit accordingly, or lose all they have in a general bankruptcy. There is no other way out than self-sacrifice all round.

But what tragedy it all has been, and is—this maneuvering for positions in a national conflict, this lack of candor and reason on both sides, this playing with fire, this refusal by the leaders of the nation, the newspapers and the people, to look truth in the face, and to understand the real causes and conditions of our present state! We are still playing the fool with facts, concentrating on quack remedies for minor ailments, while we are stricken by a disease which can only be cured by a combined national policy based upon understanding of larger issues, enormous courage, general sacrifice, and spiritual magnanimity.

What is now the character and temper of British labor? Upon that answer depends not only the future of England, and of the British Empire, but to a great extent the future of white civilization in Europe. For England is still the rock upon which the European nations largely cling for safety—a moral as well as a material rock. If England were to go the way of revolution, or fall into chaos and anarchy, it is my firm conviction that there would be no hope at all for Europe, which would fall rapidly itself into decay and despair. France cannot save herself without English help; Italy cannot; there would be no indemnities from Germany. Russian Bolshevism would find open gates; the Mohammedan powers would sweep down upon defenseless minorities; the moral structure of Europe would collapse. All that is certain, beyond all arguments or dispute. What, then, is the character and temper of English labor?

It is truculent, aggressive, and, in minorities here and

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

there, revolutionary. The actual labor leaders, men like Thomas, G. N. Barnes, Clynes, Lansbury, and others, are more moderate than the rank and file behind them. Thomas especially is a man of statesmanlike views, much education and experience, who has no desire to become a revolutionary figure or to work the machine of labor organization by violent and shattering conflict. Behind the moderate leaders, however, there is a strong pressure of younger and more reckless men who are eager to use the power of the trade-union for political as well as economic purposes—which is a new claim as far as English labor is concerned. Several times they have tried their strength in this way, with doubtful results, because it is contrary to the instincts of the great body of middle-class folk who still represent the deciding factor in English life. The attempt of the coal miners to dictate the policy of the government beyond the arbitrament of wages, to regulate prices to the consumer, failed quickly and resulted in surrender. But there was recently another action on the part of organized labor which proved the political power of their organization when supported by the general conviction of the country. It was when there was a rumor, not unsupported by evidence, that the government proposed to raise a military expedition for the attempted overthrow of the Soviet regime in Russia, in defense of Poland. This was more than mere popular rumor. It was sufficiently grave to cause a leading article in the London *Times* announcing that England was as near to a new great war, calling upon all the strength and sacrifice of the people, as in 1914. The trade-unions set up overnight a central committee which they called a Council of Action, and sent word to the government that the whole power of organized labor in England would be used to prevent any such war. The government replied that they had no inten-



## THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN ENGLISH LIFE

tion of preparing a new military expedition. . . . It did not take place.

All this is undoubtedly revolutionary in its spirit. It is a new phase of the labor movement in England, which up to recent years was entirely limited to the economic conditions of industrial life. It is stoked up and inflamed by the outpost leaders of Bolshevism who have established themselves strongly in Glasgow, Liverpool, and Wales. They are out for destruction. They want to smash all the structure of English government, all order, all law. They are in direct touch with Russian and other foreign communists, and they do not shrink from the thought of the same methods and the same results as those in the Russian upheaval. Lately, however, the communist theory has been discredited and largely abandoned by the mass of English workers, many of whom, for a time, were inclined to believe that this was the new and true gospel of democratic progress. The visits of English labor leaders to Russia, and their unanimous condemnation of the Bolshevik autocracy and the slave state of the Russian workers, undeceived the majority even of the younger hotheads. But although the philosophy of communism has been dropped like a sharp-edged weapon cutting the hand that held it, there is still a vague, loose, and dangerous current of revolutionary impulse in English labor ranks, not less menacing because undecided in its purpose.

The successive waves of unemployment which many of the workers believe to be deliberately engineered by employers in order to keep down prices are intensifying the spirit of revolt and of challenge to the present order of things. This spirit is patronized, rather flattered, by a number of the younger intellectuals, who play about with the idea of revolution as children with fire, not knowing that they will be burned up if the red embers jump out of the grate.



purposes that seem to  
Disappointment with the  
troubles of industry, th  
central Europe, the burd  
heavily, and the fear of r  
all confidence in the men  
of England. They have  
failed in the larger vision.  
with passion and no wisdo  
off trouble in England by  
redeemed. This failure—  
great leadership, which i  
seething discontent which  
events, serious disturbance  
life. And the state of Eu  
beginning to touch Englan

Yet, though I see the  
darkness, I believe that En  
carry on. There is in Eng  
tive, inarticulate wisdom.  
fications caused by war, th  
a sense of compromise and  
longs to centuries of Engli  
deadened. The passion



## THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN ENGLISH LIFE

centuries there have been worse times than now, but people have suffered them with patience, with hard resolution, with high and noble valor. They have always taken the middle way. I think they will now. Out of present trouble England will emerge with her old spirit of stolidity, resource, and energy. If not, then other peoples will be hurt, grievously. If England goes down in decay, so will all Europe, and even America will not be scathless. If the British Empire, dependent still on England as the axle wheel of its progress, breaks up or falls apart, there will be a flaming anarchy in its ancient possessions—in India, Egypt, Africa—before which the horrors of the last war will be but playful things. If the English people take the road to revolution no country will be safe for democracy, or in any way secure of life, and white civilization, as we now know it and like it, will be doomed. Other races, not white, will press forward over our ruin and decadence. But that, by the grace of God and the spirit of a great race, shall not happen yet, unless madness overtakes all sanity, which must not happen.

## VII

### THE WARNING OF AUSTRIA

#### I

THE new Republic of Austria created by the Treaty of Versailles—that is to say, by certain elderly diplomats sitting round a table and rearranging the map of the world without much knowledge of the human hopes and agonies involved in their decisions—became a tragic object lesson of all that was most miserable, hopeless, and diseased in the malady of Europe after the war. All the economic evils that afflicted such a country as Italy and threatened many other countries like France and Germany, and to some extent England, reached their fullest development in Austria.

Other countries were overburdened by war debts, weakened by the decreasing production of labor, and poverty-stricken by the inflation of money, which was turned out easily enough from the printing presses but had not reality enough to buy raw material or the elementary necessities of life from more prosperous parts of the world, so that the value of this paper money dropped low in foreign exchanges, while prices soared to fantastic heights and wages struggled to keep pace with them—and failed. Even England was touched by that disease—England which was envied by all her neighbors as rich and fat in her prosperity—and France and Italy were seriously sick of the same economic malady. But Austria was more than sick—Austria was dying.

## THE WARNING OF AUSTRIA

It was a ghoulish thing to sit at the deathbed of those Austrian people, as I did, studying the symptoms of this mortality, watching the death agony, probing into the cause of this scourge. Yet if Europe would save herself from something like the same doom and find a way of escape from a general danger which was creeping closer to many countries, the truth must be known. For the state of Austria was a tremendous rebuke to the shortsighted diplomacy which utterly failed to realize that a rearrangement of political frontiers must be based upon the physical needs and conditions of the people within those boundaries, and that it is not possible to violate historical evolution for the sake of a theory without upsetting a natural equilibrium. It was also a tragic warning to all the nations of Europe that if theyarked back to an intense national egotism, building barriers between themselves and their neighbors, checking the natural flow of trade and refusing co-operation and mutual helpfulness, their own vitality and wealth would be impoverished and their own life menaced by the illness of surrounding peoples. That lesson was not yet been learned.

Poor Austria was the world's most horrible example of the results of political cruelty and stupidity, and yet by a strange irony of fate was also the most striking case of a general desire in the hearts of mankind for charity and brotherhood leading to some new system of international politics which might give real life and power to a League of Nations. That was a most extraordinary state of things which startled one as soon as one entered the city of Vienna with its stricken population. The psychology of those two and a half million people almost defied analysis because of this conflict between cruelty and charity of which they were the victims. They saw themselves literally sentenced to death by the provisions of the peace treaty. Once belonging


their old sources of supplies with surrounding nations with surrounding their government. They drew the boundaries of an isolation camp in the center divided now into groups cut off the head of the Vienna is a bulbous-h

It is exactly as though amputated from the United States were bounded on one side the north by the sea divorced from its great trade, its mineral wealth state of six and a half obliged to import nearly lacks all raw material the exception of wood linen, leather, nor copper land than at its maximum for three months a year states like Czecho-Slovakia, once of her own

## THE WARNING OF AUSTRIA

them, they might well have hated the nations who were their judges and their executioners. But the very peoples who condemned them to death were those who by charity and not by cruelty endeavored to postpone execution and to keep them alive. Sir William Goode, who went to Vienna as chairman of the reparation committee charged with the task of securing the indemnity according to the treaty, found himself obliged by all the instincts of humanity, with the consent of the governments he represented, to transform his reparation committee into a committee of relief. Great Britain voted a sum of thirty-five million pounds for the relief of Austria. The Swiss Red Cross, first to attempt rescue of the stricken Austrians, was followed by the enormous organization of Mr. Hoover, distributing supplies from the United States and Canada. The Scandinavian nations co-operated in this work of international charity, which, as Mr. Joseph Redlich, the Austrian representative on the League of Nations, has written, was the first, and for some time the only, manifestation of that spirit of national solidarity which during the war had been preached by President Wilson in his famous messages. This distinguished Austrian reveals the gratitude of his people in the following words:

“This work of international charity has saved the lives of thousands of babies in Vienna. It has, through the organization of the Society of Friends of England, healed innumerable mothers. It has, by the energy and humanity of Mr. Hoover and his compatriots, nourished for more than two years hundreds of thousands of children in the schools of Vienna and industrial centers. It has lavished on us inestimable consolations, because not only have we benefited by such magnificent charity, but all humanity itself, crushed by this terrible war, has obtained moral profit from it. It is, therefore, the sacred duty of an Austrian to celebrate with all his



When I went to the city  
dreadful journey from [ ]  
traveled was crowded with  
desperately anxious to reach  
then, and wonder now, what  
way. For Vienna had no  
them except at monstrous  
no hope for any of them,  
Yet every day I stayed there  
ing into the city and not knowing  
of psychology at which I  
for a mad kind of gaiety in  
ing together of doomed people  
times of plague made men  
for to-morrow we die." [ ]  
as vultures follow the trail  
corpses. They were humiliated  
the disease of a nation by  
mercantile adventures in  
rich enemies of Austria, and  
getting the value of the [ ]

## THE WARNING OF AUSTRIA

these paper notes from vast stocks of paper with reckless hands. So every hotel in a city of hotels was crowded with people sleeping on sofas, in bathrooms and drawing-rooms—anywhere for shelter.

On the night of my arrival I hired a cab with two horses driven by a man who had the skill and passion of a Roman charioteer. At a furious gallop through a wet darkness he took me to many hotels in different parts of the city, laughed heartily when I was refused admittance time and time again, and shook hands like a friend and a brother when by a wild stroke of luck I managed to struggle into a small hotel owing to the favor of an Austrian waiter who had fond memories of Leicester Square. I paid my driver what I thought was three times his proper fare, but he scrunched up the notes and said: "I have to live! This would not buy me a packet of cigarettes!" In the end I gave him a hundred kronen and thought I had been robbed, but one day in Vienna was enough to teach me that this sum would hardly buy a meal in any modest restaurant.

On that first night in Vienna a dreadful gloom, spiritual as well as physical, encompassed me when I went out into the streets for an evening walk—those streets which I remembered as so full of light and gayety and music before the war. Only a few lights glimmered. The great arc lamps were not burning. No gleam came through the shuttered windows. At six o'clock all the shops were closed, and there were not many people about in the darkness. They passed me like ghosts, and I saw through the gloom pale, haggard faces of men and women who shivered as they walked. Children with bare feet padded past on the wet pavements. One woman with a baby in her arms stopped before me and held out a skinny, clawlike hand and begged for money. Truly, I thought, I have come to a city of tragedy.



...ing slowly but very  
soup, with beautiful girl  
night's meal, and middl  
children wither and die,  
these millions in the back  
did city, with its palaces, i  
gardens, its noble archit  
and mansions.

Yet here were strange, i  
reckless luxury and starvin  
despair, which deceived n  
one side, or could not re  
reason. Night after nigh  
streets and the places of  
babies' crèches, the feedin  
to push through the swin  
or concert hall and sit there  
to the music and find some

These places were alwa  
was always made up of tl  
great numbers of prospero  
to have illimitable supplie  
them were Italians, some o  
ians, Hungarians. and T



## THE WARNING OF AUSTRIA

while the band played piece after piece with a brilliant gayety which seemed to pretend that life is very merry, free from care, full of sunshine, beauty, laughter, love.

There was plenty of love in these places, but not of a kind good to see on the whole. Now and then my eyes were taken by young Austrian couples, who sat hand in hand or with their faces very close together and their eyes lighted by each other's light, and I thought they were pitiful to see, yet beautiful, like lovers shipwrecked on a desert place, with death about them and drawing near, so that perhaps this love was all they had, and enough. But mostly the lovemaking was bought by the prosperous-looking men, who were giving wine and cake to girls who, I guessed, had had no solid food that day and were paying for it by laughter and flirtation and the open marketing of their youth. They seemed nice girls, as good as your sisters or mine, of middle class, of decent upbringing, but now citizens of Vienna, which is starving, victims of a life where death is on the prowl, and a creeping disease of weakness, and where hunger is a familiar and frightening thing. Here in these places of luxury there was the glitter of light and warmth, at least of human breath and bodies, and the splendor of marble halls and the blare of jazz bands and fancy cakes for those whose purses bulged with paper money. Such a chatter! Such ripples of laughter! Such a joyous rhythm in the music of the band! But I thought of the hours, of the days, I had spent among rickety children, scrofulous children, and children who are saved from the hunger death only by the charity of their former enemies. I thought of words spoken to me by one of the men who know best the conditions of their country:

“Unless the powers formulate some policy—on a broader line than free meals and temporary aid—the Austrian people are doomed beyond any hope of

were like the people in  
plague raging around  
told amorous, wicked ta  
death would touch them  
alone like that? Were  
Europe, perhaps even En  
was called until the unre  
put to the cruel test of tr  
gay old game of life can  
crept nearer—the Europ  
cured quickly lest we die?

Profiteering was shamele  
and there were still million  
were able to afford the nec  
of life in spite of the wild ir  
It was they and the forei  
who had saved up money  
market prices controlled b  
ically—and adopted a syst  
*handlung* as it is called—so

## THE WARNING OF AUSTRIA

gone to buy their week's supplies direct from the peasants. Those country folk demanded more and more paper money for their eggs and butter and bacon and vegetables. In some districts they would not deliver their goods for any price in paper, but insisted upon a system of barter by which in return for food they got tobacco, boots, clothes, and manufactured articles.

I know the case of a man who went to one of these peasants to buy food for his wedding. He wore a new jacket which he had saved for his wedding day.

The peasant farmer refused his paper money, made an ugly grimace at it, and said: "That filth is no good to me. I will give you a sucking pig for that jacket."

The bargain was made, and the bridegroom went home in his shirt sleeves with his wedding feast under his arm.

The peasant's point of view is more apparent when I say that a cheap suit of clothes in Vienna cost four thousand kronen when I was in that city. After that prices steadily mounted in paper values, and price of meat and fat had risen by a third and even a half, so that one pound of lard cost, nominally, five pounds, or twenty-five dollars in American money, with exchange at the normal rate, at the end of last year. The peasants raised the price of flour to such an extent that it was beyond the reach of all but the robber profiteers—those gangs of financial harpies who still, by juggling with the money market and gambling in the rise and fall of Austrian securities, contrived to amass vast stocks of paper currency. It was they and the foreigners crowding into the city who spent five hundred kronen for a single person at dinner, and five times that amount if they indulged in expensive wines. The cost of a dinner followed by a dance, given by an American and his wife to members of Viennese society at the Hotel Bristol was more than a million kronen, worth forty-two

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

thousand pounds in English money, according to the prewar value of Austrian kronen.

It will be said by my readers: "But, after all, that means very little, because the money is turned out of the printing presses and has hardly any real value."

That is true for those who can get hold of the printing press, as it were, but it is not true in the case of the struggling middle-class folk—clerks, schoolmasters, doctors, university professors, workingwomen with little homes and hungry babes, and the whole class of laboring men. They do not get unlimited supplies of this paper. I asked a young clerk in a newspaper office how much he was paid a week, and he told me a hundred and sixty kronen. I remembered that it had cost me more than a hundred kronen to get a meal of three thin courses which left me hungry.

"How do you live?" I asked.

"I don't," he said.

In a babies' clinic filled with haggard, anæmic women who had brought their terrible little babes, all scrofulous and boneless, for medical examination, I spoke to a young Austrian doctor, and he told me very frankly that his own case was hopeless.

"I get under two hundred kronen a week," he said, "and for three years I have lived mostly on cabbage soup, with now and then potatoes for a treat. Not in all this time have I eaten meat. These clothes I wear date from before the war. You see they have been turned. When they wear out and fall away from me I shall be like old Adam, for how can I buy a new suit? My case is no worse than thousands of others. It is beggary and starvation."

In the great hospitals of Vienna, the best medical schools in the world before the war by universal reputation, it became almost impossible to carry on the work, owing to the dearth of supplies. Fuel was their great


## THE WARNING OF AUSTRIA

need, and many of the wards closed down because they could not be heated at all, and the patients were crowded together for warmth's sake in spite of the dangers of bad ventilation. Coal was almost out of the question, and wood was gathered from the neighboring countryside as much as possible. It was the only source of fuel for poor folk, and one of the sights of Vienna was the crowd of wood gatherers coming back laden with logs and branches under which children and women staggered to their hearthsides.

### IV

In the midst of all this misery, and of the false, mad gayety which mocks at it, the relief committees, American and British, the Society of Friends, and other charitable agencies bring some light and joy by the enormous rescue work they continue to do among the children and nursing mothers. The network of this organization is on a wide-reaching scale, and one of the most moving and pathetic sights that have ever met my eyes was when I went to the old palace of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand, whose death was the straw which set Europe alight, and watched the feeding of more than a thousand children under the direction of an American officer and his assistants.

I talked with many of the little ones as they bent over the bowls of soup and offered up a grace to God before their first spoonful. For many of them it was the first meal of the day, and for some the only meal. They were grateful for it, with the smiling gratitude of children who were born to suffering as a usual, common thing. But in spite of all this international work of charity, the large sums of money poured into Vienna from many countries, there is still a large population there which is not touched by the work of rescue. The



ingredient of uneatable  
effects upon the bodies o  
ber last many railway m  
strike as a protest against  
Democrats announced to  
it hard to calm the wo  
and despairing because c  
the food of revolution.

The conditions I have c  
Intellectually as well  
Vienna are at least half st:  
afford to buy foreign bo  
keep abreast with modern  
Even in the elementary sc  
both teachers and scholars  
their work. So in all de  
one sees a devitalizing pr  
tional and individual ene  
the social body.

Yet so cruel is the exte  
and intensification of selfis  
developed since the war by  
of nations on more ideal

## THE WARNING OF AUSTRIA

a hand to rescue the Viennese. The Czechs, with those old memories still rankling, deal contemptuously and tyrannically with the German minorities in their midst, and make it a crime for them to use their own language in the streets and public places of towns where they form a great part of the population. There is no hope for Vienna nor—carrying the argument over to other countries—for Europe itself, if that national and racial enmity is maintained.

This state of things in Austria ought to be a tremendous warning to all Europeans. What is happening in Vienna so acutely—all those symptoms of disease—will become apparent in many other countries of Europe unless there is a speedy cure. These symptoms of social plague are the inflation of paper money, which is a mere sham covering the lack of real values; the difficulty of procuring raw material from more prosperous countries owing to the difference in exchange; the gradual weakening of the individual worker and of the nation as a whole in physical well-being and moral will power; the debility of children, working mothers and laboring men, so that the future of the race is endangered and the birth rate is lowered, while the death rate goes up; a spiritual carelessness as to these evil conditions so that they come to be accepted as inevitable, and a levity of the social mind among those who still have money to spend, which disregards the necessity of urgent action, desperate remedies, in order to maintain the old standards of civilization.

It is difficult for ordinary minds to think in terms of Europe or beyond the frontiers of nationality; but if one studies the health chart of Europe as a whole one will find very clearly a spreading blackness corresponding to the areas constantly enlarging and embracing new peoples, in which there is economic disease and what I may call the withering of civilized life. The whole



so that all the impulses toward  
tion are for a time at least de  
fighting with hunger, fighting  
the barest necessities of life, and  
luxury and joy, in which civiliz

The Russian disease is reac  
states like Esthonia and Litl  
withering from the same causes  
devitalizing of labor, physical  
Poland is a strong soul with a s

Is this plague creeping wo  
certainty that it will stop at th  
Austria is engulfed already,  
there are signs that in spite o  
back to the old standards of wo  
and profit of the big trusts to  
her people are sickening.

Already at the end of last yea  
of children in Germany were s  
tion, and not only the child  
Seven hundred thousand child  
being fed on charity, and ever  
the shadow of starvation, if n  
acute and terrible stage, was on



## THE WARNING OF AUSTRIA

it as the outstanding example of tragedy, due not to inherent weakness, but to the evil structure of international relations. There is only one hope of rescue for Austria, and that is the breaking down of the hatred round her, the opening of trade relationships with her neighbors, a give-and-take in the matter of raw material, labor and commercial credit, co-operation instead of isolation and rivalry, Christian fellowship for mutual help and protection, instead of the cutthroat code of the old tribal laws. And that, in my humble judgment, is the one hope of rescue not only for Austria, but for Europe as a whole.

## VIII

### THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

#### I

**T**O England as well as to Ireland friendship between our two peoples is utterly necessary for the sake of liberty, progress, honor, and peace of mind. The self-government of the Irish people is essential to the liberties of the English people, because until that is obtained we who are English or Scottish will never be free from a political conflict within our own island which cuts across every party issue, obscures our own domestic interests, and gives passionate war cries on one side or the other, to politicians who prefer passion as a bait for votes rather than intellectual argument.

But England needs peace with Ireland for higher reasons than that. She needs it to regain her moral character in the judgment of foreign nations and of her own people in the far dominions; she needs it for her own soul's sake.

The Irish tragedy poisoned the mind of the world against us, and the wells of our own faith. It convicted us against our will, against our own sense of truth and honor, against the noblest and most generous instincts of the best among us, of most damnable hypocrisy. Justly or unjustly, by truth or by lies—I will tell what I think is the truth—the Irish people were able to charge us with that vice and bring down upon us the scorn or wrath of all our enemies (and we have many), while arousing suspicion or surprise among our few best

## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

friends. During the war we had proclaimed high ideals for humanity, and hundreds of thousands of our men died, as many of them thought, to make them prevail. It was, we said, a spiritual fight against the brute force of militarism. It was a war against Prussianism in all its forms. Afterward, when peace should come, we would demand the self-determination of oppressed nations, we should protect the right of the little peoples, we should establish a reign of liberty within a League of Nations governed by an international court of justice administering a new code of world-wide peace. Into these high sentiments, expressed fervently by English idealists, came inevitably at public meetings one sharp interjection—"What about Ireland?" That question was what a friend of mine calls a "conversation stopper." At best it would make the most fluent speaker pause a moment in his rush of oratory.

Yes, after all, what about Ireland? We had established martial law there of a kind never known even in Austria or Russia on such a scale in proportion to population, with tanks, armored cars, machine guns, airplanes, all the equipment of modern warfare, after "the war to end war." Justly or unjustly, we had at least adopted Prussian methods, after killing Prussian militarism. In Ireland, rightly or wrongly, we had abandoned the ideal of self-determination. And pleading abominable provocation, the essential justice of checking a murder campaign, the right to repress rebellion against the Crown, we were allowing our military and police forces to adopt the old primitive law of an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, without any reference at all to other laws of a more recent and more civilized kind.

All civil law was abolished in Ireland, at a time when English idealists were pleading for its extension to inter-

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

national affairs as a nobler method of argument than that of war. In Ireland trial by jury had been replaced by courts-martial, in which the accused were often the judges. Inquests on the bodies of murdered civilians had been replaced by military inquiries in which no evidence was admitted if distasteful to the court. Any Irish man or woman could be arrested without a charge and imprisoned without trial, and thousands of them were thus arrested and imprisoned. Though Ministers of the Crown referred to the strife in Ireland as "war," we shot or hanged our prisoners if taken with arms in their hands, and though for many months the same Ministers denied that our soldiers and police took revenge for their own losses by "reprisals" against Irish people and property, that system of meeting terror by counter-terror was afterward admitted and made official. When, therefore, our Prime Minister and his colleagues, or any other public or private person, spoke of the spiritual hopes of the world, the right of majorities to the liberty of self-government, the duty of France to demobilize her armies and her hatreds, the justice of the punishment inflicted upon Austria for her former tyrannies against subject peoples, or the cruelties of Germany in Belgium, that cry of, "What about Ireland?" came as a confusing and conscience-pricking interruption.

For it is not in the English character to be insensitive to criticism or satire so poignant as that. If we are hypocritical as a people, it is not through insincerity, but through stupidity or ignorance, or particular prejudice. We do not and cannot, as a nation, ride roughshod over justice, or liberty, or fair play, without stirrings of conscience that hurt horribly. Not deliberately, or without an immense amount of argument in self-justification, can we, as a people, accept a policy of brutality or tyranny. There is an inexhaustible store

## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

of generous feeling among English folk, amounting almost to weakness, in regard to smaller people than themselves, to all helpless and little things, to all under dogs. That generosity can only be overwhelmed by a wave of passion, or blinded by ignorance that tyranny is at work or injustice established. This Irish tragedy, therefore, has been England's tragedy as well, for it tortured many minds among us, and was bitterly resented by those who desired to crush the rebellion by all ways of force, as well as by those who detested the methods and morals of military repression, because the very name of Ireland laid us open to attack, put disgrace upon us, challenged our honor and our decent reputation in the world. The Irish made use of that weapon, more powerful against our prestige than the revolvers of their "gunmen." They knew that we were vulnerable to that form of attack, because, whatever our faults may be, we stand or fall in the world by our reputation for justice, and not by the power of guns. So Ireland felt sure of winning most of what she wanted if she could put us in the wrong, and our politicians gave them a thousand chances.

Irish propaganda—like all propaganda one-sided and not careful of exact truth—was wonderfully organized and far reaching. It found its way, day after day, month after month, into the newspapers of America, France (when France was annoyed with us), Italy, Russia, Poland, and all our own dominions, where its accounts of raids and imprisonings, shootings, hangings, and burnings stirred the deepest emotion of people who had Irish blood in their veins, or a sense of chivalry and indignation among others. The darker, murderous side of Sinn Fein outrages were but lightly touched, and the Irish picture presented to the world through its literary agents was the simple and stirring spectacle of a little people fighting with heroic spirit against a brutal

their enemies, who for  
civil progress in Europe  
and betray their best  
We cannot understand

So spoke our friend  
other countries, as I know  
the French people, who  
rebellion, who are not  
scandalized by the English  
one Frenchman who spoke  
on the western front,  
plained his perplexity  
script in which he said  
savage little sentence,

If our friends talked  
They found this Irish  
provided them with one  
abomination of England  
"always was and always  
For centuries he has pushed  
thrust his fist into the face  
native races of his country  
increased and held his



## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

enemies in every part of the world to which Irish propaganda reached.

It reached every civilized country except England. Owing to the government control of many newspapers (bought by members of the Coalition to stifle criticism and spread political propaganda of their own), and on account of the timidity or incredulity or dishonesty of others not so bought, the only facts published in the majority of English newspapers after the Irish rebellion of 1916 were those provided by Dublin Castle or the Front Bench in the House of Commons. In that way there was, for a long time, an almost complete boycott of any news which tended to discredit our officials or armed forces in Ireland, while on the other hand full publicity was given to all Sinn Fein outrages and crimes. A few journals, like the *Daily News*, the *Manchester Guardian*, and *The Nation*, succeeded in breaking through this conspiracy of silence, but they only reached a limited public and were under suspicion as unpatriotic or revolutionary sheets by readers who think that all criticism of government is unpatriotic and that all truth which disturbs the self-righteousness of the English conservative mind is revolutionary.

The Sinn Fein activists of the "Irish Republican Army," described more briefly as the "Irish gunmen," spoiled the beautiful picture of a heroic people fighting nobly for liberty's sake, by acts of brutality and methods of warfare which could not be condoned or forgiven by any soul alive who hated cruelty and still had faith in Christian ethics. These acts were reported to the English people without mention of reprisals or cruelties on the other side, or with absolute denials by public officials of any such charge against themselves and their agents. Only by rumors, by tales told privately, in whispers, by seeing smoke and suspecting fire, was the average Englishman aware of any dirty work which



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

might smirch our honor in the world. That was so for at least a year after the ending of the war, until admissions were made in the House of Commons, and facts were admitted in papers like the *Times*, which charged our Irish administration with action and policy contrary—to say the least—to our traditions of honor and justice. I think our only excuse in history, as a people, for permitting the dishonesty and villainy of some of our statesmen, who played into the hands of Sinn Fein by adopting evil as a cure for evil, is our general ignorance of what was happening, and the wide, unbridgeable gulf that lies between English and Irish mentality.

### II

There is, of course, one type of mind in England which made any reasonable settlement of Ireland impossible through the centuries, and will make it impossible now if he can. He is actually the old type of John Bull Englishman, hardly exaggerated by his caricature, but utterly unrepresentative of the nation as a whole—hard in his imperialism, narrow in his Protestantism, reactionary against any effort of change or progress, sure that the Englishman of his own type is the noblest effort of God, disliking all aliens, including Irish, Welsh, and Scotch, and a firm believer in “resolute rule” with machine guns and tanks for all rebellious people, such as native races, and workingmen who want more wages. He was the defender of the Amritsar massacre. He is all for shooting down the unemployed if they make themselves annoying. He would like to see a rounding up of all socialists, labor leaders, and intellectual theorists who are endeavoring to change the old structure of English life with its Heaven-sent prerogatives of great landed estates for the “good families,” high profits for the capitalists, and low

## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

rages for the working class. His ideas on Ireland are clear and sharp. "The Irish people," he says, "are just savages, and they must be dealt with as such. Shoot them down wholesale if they won't obey English law. Reprisals? Certainly, and plenty of them. More power to their elbow! as Mr Balfour said. Let our men have free hand and teach 'em what's what! If necessary, have a new conquest of Ireland, with blood and fire, and do it well this time. The best thing would be to sink the whole damned island."

That type of man is still to be found in many places and classes of English life, and it was his type which supported Sir Hamar Greenwood and the Prime Minister's Tory masters in their policy of reprisals and counter-terror. He is to be found in sporting clubs down Pall Mall and St. James's Street, on the race course at Epsom, in the crowd that goes to see a prize fight, in the manor house of a country squire, often in the rectory of a country parish. But his type—not without use in his time—is old-fashioned and dwindling away. Even before the war he was passing, and when the war came his dogmatic opinions were heard with laughter at mess tables where young officers of ours who had been thinking hard about many problems of life and death, the causes of the war and the hopes of the world, were not taking his blusterings as the last word in the way of wisdom. But he still exists, and writes letters to the *Morning Post*, which is published exclusively for his class and ideas. Throughout the Irish trouble he sat solid in the Coalition Government, fuming and fretting over the weakness of the Prime Minister who was always tempted to compromise with the forces of disorder and hardly restrained. He snorted with laughter when Terence McSwiney—with mistaken fanaticism, perhaps, but with no ignoble motive and a burning love for Ireland in his heart—died in his hunger

mand of the political mach  
the great body of moderate I  
years of this tragedy were a  
but could not, and to find  
solution to the Irish problem

This average Englishman,  
teashops, and other places of  
was mightily perplexed abou  
had poor sources of inform  
stand the Irish temperame  
the Irish problem. He stil  
and old illusions. For one  
himself to believe that the  
or cause of hatred, for Engl  
saw no adequate reason for h  
Irish with whom he came in  
where were nice people, with  
of humor, not at all murder  
liked most of their men, an  
as he knew them, and belie  
evidence to the contrary, th  
men" were only a minority  
at all represent the great bod  
therefore, their violence was

## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

men and soldiers that he began to think that there were some qualities in the Irish character which baffled him. His remembrance of old novels by Charles Lever, Samuel Lover, and other writers, as well as the stage type of Irishman traditional for a long time in England, still held his imagination with the figure of a breezy, laughing, devil-may-care, romantic soul who helped to win most of England's battles and was loyal to the flag. Gradually he was aware that there was something wrong in that picture. He found an unexpected cruelty in the Irish people, the cruelty of the peasant mind brooding over old grievances, unforgiving, relentless in the pursuit of vengeance. Where he expected weakness he found surprising strength—most obstinate resistance to English "reason." Where he looked for sentiment, especially in the war with Germany, he found the hardest realism, a most selfish refusal of allegiance, and, worst of all, black treachery to Old England in her hour of need. What was the meaning of that? "What the devil," he asked, plaintively, "is the matter with these people?"

It must be remembered that the average Englishman knows very little of Irish history. He does not read it in his school books; he does not find it in his newspapers. Vaguely he knows and admits that England in the old days was "rather rough" on Ireland, and, generously, as it seems to him, he wishes to make amends. He thinks he made amends by the Wyndham Land Acts which enabled the peasants to buy their land with English credit, and for the life of him he cannot understand why the Irish hark back to the past and refuse to recognize that England is a good friend.

He does not realize that anything England does for Ireland, or has done, or will do, is not received with gratitude as a favor, or as a generous act, but is regarded as a long-delayed concession forced from us,

their undying pride.

The average Englishman was shocked to his inmost soul. He shall never forget what he saw on the western front. He remembers the winter when the Germans came against us on the ridge of the hills, the flats and swamps and the mud in artillery, so that they could not fire and we could answer them day, night after night, and the casualty lists lengthened with the passing of youth, and we knew that our strength was being touched in strength, while they were winning stupendous victories. At that very time they were attacking in the back—did stab at the backs of ours, and of theirs, and they were down, sometimes without our firing. Irish boys sniped English officers, and some of our officers would not fire back on them, as they would not of those lads. There was

## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

peril. Count Plunkett, I am told, went in disguise to Germany to negotiate this aid. Casement in Germany was acting on his own initiative, tortured by his conscience and by his fears. When that news came to us it seemed at first incredible, and then unforgivable. It is still hard to forget or forgive by any Englishman, and by some Irishmen. An Irish general said to me: "I can never go back to Ireland—never! I can never take off my hat to an Irishman again." There were tears in his eyes as he spoke.

The average Englishman did not know the Irish defense of that act of rebellion, and, if he knew, would not admit a word of it. I know, and will set it out with fairness. The Sinn Feiner said, as one of their leaders said to me: "We would have fought for you if you had guaranteed our national claims. We would have fought for you if you had let us fight under our own flag and in our own Irish brigades. The Nationalist leaders (wrongly, as we now think) arranged a scheme of recruiting—which was turned down by your War Office. Hundreds of thousands of young Irishmen (stupidly, as we now believe) *did* volunteer and were drafted, not in their own brigade, as a rule, but in English battalions, and died in heaps to save the liberty of England while strengthening England's tyranny in Ireland. Gradually we saw this. England's fight for liberty was not to be our liberty. What was happening in Ulster? The Ulster volunteers who had been allowed to arm against us in 1914 were still kept back in Ulster, while our men were being massacred in Gallipoli and France. They stood solid as a menace to southern Ireland, with preferential treatment and secret help from England. Very well! We began to recruit our own volunteers. At first there were two groups—John Redmond's, designed for the help of England, and James Connolly's, for the liberty of Ireland. A split took place, led by

Dublin were against us. Th  
hardy act. After three day  
England called them, were ha  
being killed in large numbers,  
They were set on fire by the l  
the spirit of Ireland, the sou  
to its depths by pity, by pride  
ality, and then by an undying  
General Maxwell began his  
James Connolly and fourteen  
prison, with unnecessary bru  
thousand young Irish lads.  
established in every Irish  
Ulster, and the whole people v  
liberty of their nation."

The liberty of their nation!  
ing under a brutal tyranny,  
talked like that with a passion  
not be doubted, because so ma  
die, and did die, for their faith  
the English mind, not consciou  
Ireland before they rose in reb

## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

in revolt against our rule and going to all lengths in guerrilla warfare with complete ruthlessness, to obtain her desires? Or was England utterly right—or utterly wrong—in regarding this warfare as murder and trying to stamp it out by methods as ruthless as those used against her? Will England be justified in history—or Ireland? Above all, by what madness, or badness, or insanity, or stupidity, on one side or on both sides, did our two peoples come to such a pass when all law was abandoned for a bloody struggle of civil strife, ghastly in its commentary on those hopes of international peace and the progress of humanity which surged up in many hearts out of the utter horror of the European war?

To answer these questions one must go back to ancient history, and deal with passion as well as with facts, and with illusion as well as with reality, for there can be no understanding of what has happened in recent days without a knowledge of the past.

The past calls to the present in the Irish mind, like the cry of the banshee wailing through the ages of Irish history. The English forget their past, at least in its most hideous aspect, looking at the present with realistic eyes and forward to the future with what hope they have. But the Irish have a long, bitter, relentless memory which is a morbid wound in their psychology. The English say, "Let the dead past bury its dead," but the Irish rake over old bones and make relics of them for animating their passion afresh.

I saw the strength and passion of Irish memory before the war, in Dublin. On a Saturday night there would be little groups of people at the corners of back streets listening to young men or girls standing on orange boxes and singing or reciting old songs and ballads. I listened to them sometimes, and always they were ballads of Irish episodes long forgotten and meaningless in the



... they belong to  
Their songs are filled  
the passion of a people  
in Irish ears from the c  
going one night to a  
Oyster Bar" with some  
one young Jew. Outsi  
playing a fiddle and w  
play some jig tunes for  
tunes she played made  
of tragedy that broke e  
the Irishmen in our com  
her fiddle, the young Jew  
wept in sympathy, and c  
descended from one of  
was the effect on a Jew,  
of an Irish Catholic whe  
his race? They are croc  
his cradle, or is carried in  
From the time he learns t  
old songs, in which the I  
English. And from the ti  
are filled with "the wrc  
tyranny of the Saxon. F

## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

broidered gowns and all the arts and crafts of life gave them a civilization and a culture at a time when England was inhabited by brutal, unlettered Saxons, and when northern Europe was still uncultured.

Some of that is true, but what is less known to the Irish is the downfall of their own glory by an internecine strife in which the English had no part, when their own "kings"—at one time no less than sixty—fought against one another until the island was laid waste and its people reduced to misery by the incessant raids and ravagings, burnings and slaughterings, of rival clans.

"Why did the English ever go to Ireland? Who asked them to go, anyway?" shouted a voice from the gallery of a hall in New York when I was lecturing there, and not to score a point, but as a fact of history, I gave the answer that the English went at the request of Pope Adrian IV, in the reign of Henry II, "to check the tide of crime, to restore Christian worship, and to reform the manners of the people," as he wrote in his papal bull. But, as I admitted to the New York audience, also in the interests of truth and history, the advent of the English and their subsequent acts did not give the world, or the Irish, an object lesson in good manners. Our manners were disgusting, and our methods abominable.

They were Normans rather than English who went to Ireland with the consent of Henry II, and they parceled out Ireland, after fierce fights with the Irish chieftains, very much as their predecessors had invaded and partitioned England in the time of William the Conqueror. But there was always a territory which the Norman chiefs in Ireland never penetrated, and in this country "beyond the pale," as it was called, the Irish kept to their own customs and laws until they captured their conquerors by the beauty of their women, and many of the Norman invaders, like the Geraldines, became "more Irish than the Irish."

... 1534, and at the  
ment to pass a mea  
declared that all E  
Ireland and that all  
should be confined t  
approved by the King  
That was really the b  
struggle between the  
Always there have b  
revolt against the pow  
the ruling caste in En  
its authority, though it  
by lawyers and histori:

The story of that b  
itself, but they still re  
defied the English rig  
bloody massacres by El  
sent to suppress their

A fatal thing, the v  
Ireland, happened w  
Tudors. It was under  
long strife, was first co  
tant settlers in Ulster,  
after a massacre in 1641



## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

temperament, in every political tradition. It was the sowing of dragon's teeth in Ireland.

Oliver and his Roundheads killed the Irish Catholics with the joy of religious fanaticism, and the deeds they did in the name of the Lord are remembered with the sweat of agony in Irish blood. Oliver had his own plan to end all Irish trouble. It was to fill the island with more Scots and English, and transport the Irish to penal settlements beyond the sea, where most of them might die. In some measure his plan was fulfilled. Connaught alone was made into a reservation for the Irish, into which thousands of them were driven like cattle, and Irish women and girls were shipped off to slavery in the West Indies. It was a crime that cried out to God for vengeance, and Sinn Fein has remembered it after three centuries. What is one of the miracles of history is the survival of the Irish spirit and of their race and faith. With one brief respite in the reign of James II, for whom they rose when he lost the English crown, and then the Irish harp, at the battle of the Boyne, the policy of Protestant England for those three hundred years or so was to kill Catholicism in Ireland, and destroy the Catholic Irish, if not by physical extermination, at least by causing the death of their trade, their industries, their political power, their racial spirit, their language, their laws, and their religion.

William III enacted the penal laws which in successive reigns ruled out a Catholic Irishman from all human dignity. No Catholic was allowed to sit in the Irish Parliament (whose privileges were constantly reduced), nor to have any voice in making the laws of his own land, nor to hold any public office. His priests were hunted like vermin from hovel to hovel, and killed when caught. No Irishman, as late as the nineteenth century, could own a horse worth more than five pounds, and any Protestant enemy might demand it from him

went up owing to the

So great was the mi  
derful their spirit, s  
English rule which de  
lest it should compet  
the Protestant memb  
Henry Grattan, revolt  
Catholics and voted f  
the time of the Amer  
Grattan was supporte  
volunteers who had e  
force against American  
this movement, the Br  
an Act of Catholic em  
the Catholic bogey alv  
fright, at the eleventh l  
was then that the vol  
force, under the name  
rebellion. In the time  
made overtures to Napo.  
as a century later

## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

In 1782, before the outburst of that rebellion, but when there was a demand for coercive measures against the Irish volunteers, Charles James Fox warned the British government of the danger of such policy, and the liberality and wisdom of his words might have rung in the ears of British Ministers when, after a hundred and thirty years, history repeated itself.

The Irish, finding that they had nothing to expect in the British House of Commons from the justice of their demands, found resources in themselves; they armed; their Parliament spoke out; and the very next year, the same Minister who had before put a negative on all their expectations, came down to the House and made the *amende honorable* for his past conduct, gave to the demands of an armed people infinitely more than he had refused to the modest application of an unarmed, humble nation. Such had been the conduct of the then Minister and his colleagues; and this was the lesson which the Irish had been taught: "If you want anything, seek for it not unarmed and humbly, but take up arms and speak manfully and boldly to the British Ministry, and you will obtain more than at first you might have ventured to expect."

This was the consequence, said Fox, of the ill use of the superintending power of the British Parliament, which had made millions of subjects rise against a Power which they felt only as a scourge. At the same time Fox made it plain that he yielded to the demands of the Irish for the right to legislate for themselves without interference because he believed them to be founded on justice, and not because they were demanded with the force of arms:

"He must be a shallow politician who would resort to such means (those taken in the war with America) to enforce obedience to laws which were odious to those whom they were made to bind." For his part, he would

out of war with every  
must be to send troops o  
of calling upon her to gi  
common cause. . . . He  
that happy period when I  
blessings that attend freed  
when by the richness and  
try of her manufacturers, ;  
lation she should become  
might England look for p  
to man her fleets, and s  
England renouncing all rig  
latter would more cordial  
friend whom she loved. I  
hand, was to assume the  
Ireland, she must only m  
friend; for where there wa  
ests, and a mutual regard  
party whose interests were

After the failure of the  
agents set to work to unite  
one legislature, and they  
By payments of money, an  
votes in the Dublin Parlian

## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

And, as Lecky wrote: "In a country where the sentiment of nationality was as intense as in any part of Europe, it destroyed the national legislature contrary to the manifest wish of the people, and by means so corrupt, treacherous, and shameful that they are never likely to be forgotten. The Union of 1800 was not only a great crime, but, like most crimes—a great blunder."

After that, in the beginning of the industrial era of England, the work of ruin in Ireland was completed by "Cutthroat Castlereagh" and the manufacturing interests in the English House of Commons, who put up tariff walls against Irish industries, so blockading the commercial life of that unhappy island. Catholic emancipation was gained at last by the renewal of revolt under Daniel O'Connell, to which George IV yielded on the advice of the Duke of Wellington, who said he "wanted no more war," but the spiritual relief of the victory was overwhelmed by the agony of another tragedy in Irish history—the great famine of 1845.

I fell into trouble in America by saying that the English were not responsible at least for that act of nature, which was caused by the blight of the potato crop, upon which the main bulk of the people lived. And perhaps my critics were right in saying that, though we did not cause the blight, the famine itself would not have come if the Irish people had not been reduced to such a single source of life by our brutalities. Indeed, they were right. We cannot even claim that as comfort to our conscience. It was a chapter as terrible as anything in human history. Thousands perished of starvation and disease. They fell dead on the roadsides, and children like living skeletons climbed about the corpses of their mothers until they too died. One woman went mad and ate her own child. The Irish people fled from their own island as though it were plague-stricken, as indeed it was. They crowded into



1841.....  
1851.....  
1861.....  
1871.....  
1881.....  
1891.....  
1901.....  
1911.....

The figures for 19  
the Census was opp  
however, that they  
account of the ban  
the Irish Republican  
youth for their guerri

These figures of d  
the significance of the  
for if there had been  
would have led to a g  
not large enough to s  
sive agriculture had  
after the repeal of the  
first phase it was due t

What is the use of ra  
Because unless

## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

and rewritten, read and reread in history books and romances, told and retold with wrath, and tears, and pity, and pride (pride in the Irish spirit of resistance, its unbreakable spirit through the centuries), in every Irish school, among every Irish group of "intellectuals," and by every Irish priest. All that black drama is in the background of the Irish mind, as a tradition stronger than all modern influence, as a national heritage of the soil which inspires all their folk songs, and as a passion which may burn low at times but is ready to flame up again when the embers are stirred.

It burned low, that old passion of remembrance, some years before the war. There was almost a chance of its dying out at the end of the last century, when the Irish peasants were doing well and liberty was no longer outraged. But at that very time of increasing prosperity there was a renaissance of Irish culture, which began to stir up the embers—poets like W. B. Yeats and George Russell, historians like Barry O'Brien and Gavin Duffy, and a group of brilliant young men, both Protestant and Catholic, called back to the past and summoned up its ghosts. At first it was a purely literary movement. The Gaelic League was started to revive the Irish language and literature. Irish literary societies were established in many cities. Irish art and music, from the tenth century onward, were rediscovered and made popular. All that intellectual activity, not rebellious in its purpose, brilliant and scholarly in its expression, accepted with sympathy and enthusiasm by English students, was a new flowering time of the Irish spirit, revealing anew its wonderful endurance and its great sources of inspiration. But it awakened the old national instincts, and opened the old wounds so that they bled afresh.

Another thing happened, not without tragic consequences in the future. The Irish priesthood had

priests and it became  
Fein. For there, in  
books, meeting nor  
for the priesthood was  
and became intense  
woes of Ireland in  
The glory of Ireland  
starting point in his  
Catholic Ireland in the  
with their own faith  
England burned also  
narrow sphere of life  
from the present in  
Those young men became  
the teachers in the schools  
group of adult scholars  
ings, and the dominating  
life of rural districts.  
lived old memories and  
their hate. Afterwards  
old Nationalists and  
the priests from May  
tion to the guerrilla war  
have

## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

of Germans—though how it was done in either case was hard to understand by many simple men who believed that Christ's message was one of peace and charity rather than war and hate, at least among people who professed to worship the same God.

The intensity with which the Irish mind has been fixed upon the tragedy of Irish history has a morbid effect not unlike the "persecution mania" of advanced melancholia. To hear an Irishman talk of all the woes of the distressful isle, one might imagine that other people—and especially the English—enjoyed full liberty of self-government, a human code of laws, and great material prosperity throughout those centuries when Ireland was under the tyranny of a despotic Power, miserably impoverished, and crushed by the brutality of the penal laws. Nothing can ever excuse the abominable treatment of Ireland by English kings and statesmen prior to the Victorian era, and I shall write nothing to whitewash that black injustice, but the Irish people should broaden the horizon of their imagination by a wider knowledge of world history, including that of England. At the time when Catholics in Ireland were being hunted for their faith, there was no mercy to Catholics in England. Their priests were chased, tortured, and killed, and by unrelenting severity the old faith was destroyed throughout the length and breadth of the land. The peasants of England were hardly better than serfs, and had no land of their own, but were the hired men of the tenant farmers, paid wretched wages and thrust into miserable hovels. Even as late as the year of the last European war the farm laborers of Somersetshire and many parts of England were paid no more than fourteen shillings a week, upon which they had to keep their families. As for liberty, it needed a long and desperate struggle before the English masses were able to vote as free men

... the poorest pa  
period of English  
able by far to that  
Manchester, Bolt  
The Irish peasant, i  
lived at least a hun  
preserved his mani  
women and childre  
in the industrial tow  
little children endure  
of ancient Rome, su  
and souls, and were  
hardships and filthy  
worked fourteen hour  
and insanitary mills,  
for human beings, an  
of the machines and  
they had known the  
of joy. Their hovel  
more foul, more pest  
facturers of the Nor  
taskmasters than th  
many cases were kin  
was the liberty of a

## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

that cruel century of history which preceded the Act of Union, and afterward.

As I write, I have by my side a document which I picked up by hazard in the Old Bailey of London, before a new Court of Justice replaced the former building. It reveals in a blinding light the social state of England in the Napoleonic era. It is a list of one hundred convicts "embarked on board the Morly for New South Wales from the Dolphin Hulk at Chatham, this 29th day of July 1829, pursuant to the Right Honourable Robert Peel's order of the 15th day of July 1829." Most of the men were under middle age, many of them young boys, and all of them were sentenced to terms varying from fourteen years to penal servitude for life and transportation to Botany Bay, for petty crimes which now would be dealt with under the First Offenders Act, without imprisonment.

Thomas Cook, a boy of fifteen, gets a life sentence (which in many cases meant a death sentence, as all know who have read the story of those prison ships on their way to Australia)—for stealing an apron.

Peter Haigh, eighteen years of age, is sentenced to penal servitude for life for stealing a piece of printed cotton.

For stealing a candlestick, Thomas Porter, sixteen years of age, is sentenced to fourteen years and transportation. For stealing a piece of worsted, James Jefferies, aged seventeen, is sentenced to fourteen years and transportation; and so on throughout the list. For breaking a threshing machine (in the time of the machinery riots); for stealing handkerchiefs, or bread when they were starving, girls, as well as boys, were sentenced to death and hanged in batches as late as the early nineteenth century, in Merrie England. Looking back upon that time, I fancy Ireland was a happier isle in spite of all her misery. It was a cruel time everywhere

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

and until recent years most of us believed that we had got beyond it, to an age of greater human kindness. But the European war, and history that has happened afterward, spoiled that illusion, with many others.

When all is said and done, England used the enlightenment that came to her in happier times, to make amends in Ireland. Liberal thought in England did at last prevail as our people struggled forward to greater liberty of their own, and at last regained it. The Irish are not grateful, and pretend that we have behaved always toward them with the same intolerance and the same selfishness, but that is not the verdict of impartial history. The series of Land Acts which have enabled the Irish peasantry to possess their own soil by means of English credits were generous in their inspiration and beneficent in their result. Nor is it true to say, as Irish writers say, that those concessions were forced upon the House of Commons by the power of the Nationalist votes, for though Mr. Gladstone's first Home Rule bill of 1886 may have been influenced by that thought, the great Land Act of 1903 was passed by a Parliament in which Unionists were in a great majority over Liberals and Nationalists combined.

### v

The story of the land in Ireland is, of course, the key to many of her historical troubles, from the time the Normans seized most of it, and the best of it, from the Irish chieftains. Throughout the centuries the people were mainly agricultural, and it was the repeal of the Corn Laws in the middle of the nineteenth century which diminished wheat-growing in Ireland (as well as in England) and changed it to a cattle-raising country. This had an immense effect upon the small

## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

tenant farmers, for the landlords desired to get rid of them from their holdings, in order to increase the pasture land. Evictions took place with pitiable scenes, and, unable to get work in factories like the English peasants who were also pushed off the land, their only chance was emigration to the United States. That, as well as the famine, was, as I have said, the cause of the human tide flowing from Ireland to America.

It was in 1870 that a first attempt was made to reform the miserable land system of Ireland, and the tenant was recognized in a limited way as part owner of the soil on which he labored. Later, in 1881, Mr. Gladstone still further improved the status of the Irish tenant farmer by an Act known as the Three F's—Fair Rent, Free Sale, and Fixity of Tenure. But the beginning of prosperity in Ireland was made a reality by the Land Acts of 1891 and 1905, founded by George Wyndham, a descendant of the Irish Geraldines and a brilliant, sympathetic man, under Mr. Balfour's administration, enabling tenants to purchase their holdings on money advanced by the British government to a special Land Stock, bearing interest at  $2\frac{3}{4}$  per cent. Compulsory powers of purchase were given to the commissions appointed to administer these Acts, so that landlords could not refuse to part with their soil when it was desperately needed.

The total amount of money advanced by us for land purchase in Ireland from 1870 to 1919 was a hundred and five and a half million pounds—an immense amount of money, even now when our minds have been stunned by the grotesque figures of war debts. Nor were the Irish people asked to pay a higher interest when by war exhaustion England was forced to beg and borrow. While we were raising loans at 6 per cent, we were lending to Ireland at less than 3 per cent. In addition to the hundred and five and a half millions



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

mentioned above, we advanced nearly five million pounds to the Irish rural district councils for the building of laborers' cottages.

The world ought to know these facts, and that is why I am writing them—in case a few people in the world may read them. For it is fair and just to say that the English people had made some amends at least, not inconsiderable, not ungenerous, for their bad treatment of Ireland, and that in material prosperity as well as in the affairs of local government they were already a world away from the misery that followed the famine of '45. This cannot be disputed with any honesty by Irish writers. It is undeniable, and confirmed by many of their own leaders. Take, for instance, words spoken by John Redmond, a year after the beginning of the Great War. Though he lost favor with his own people before dying with a broken heart, no Irishman, if he has any honesty, will deny that he was a great patriot and a great gentleman, whose whole life was devoted to the country he loved. It was John Redmond who made the following statement in Australia, comparing the condition of Ireland with what it was thirty years earlier.

I went to Australia to make an appeal on behalf of an enslaved, famine-hunted, despairing people, a people in the throes of semi-revolution, bereft of all political liberties and engaged in a life-and-death struggle with the system of a most brutal and drastic coercion. Only thirty-three or thirty-four years have passed since then, but what a revolution has occurred in the interval. To-day the people, broadly speaking, own the soil; to-day the laborers live in decent habitations; to-day there is absolute freedom in the local government and the local taxation of the country; to-day we have the widest Parliament in the municipal franchise; to-day we know that the evicted tenants who are the wounded soldiers of the land war have been restored to their homes, or to other homes as good as those from which they had been originally driven. We know that the congested districts, the scene of some of the most awful horrors of



## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

the old famine days, have been transformed, that the farms have been enlarged, decent dwellings have been provided, and a new spirit of hope and independence is to-day among the people. We know that in the towns legislation has been passed facilitating the housing of the working classes. So far as the town tenants are concerned, we have this consolation, that we have passed for Ireland an Act whereby they are protected against arbitrary eviction, and are given compensation not only for disturbance from their homes, but for the good-will of the business they had created, a piece of legislation far in advance of anything obtained for the town tenants of England. I may add, far in advance of any legislation obtained for the town tenants of any other country. We know that we have at least won educational freedom in university education for most of the youth of Ireland, and we know that in primary and standard education the thirty-four years that have passed have witnessed an enormous advance in efficiency and in the means provided for bringing efficiency about. To-day we have a system of old-age pensions in Ireland whereby every old man and woman over seventy is saved from the workhouse, free to spend their last days in comparative comfort. We have a system of national industrial insurance which provides for the health of the people and makes it impossible for the poor hard-working man and woman, when sickness comes to the door, to be carried away to the workhouse hospital, and makes it certain that they will receive decent, Christian treatment during their illness.

In her material, and, indeed, in her spiritual state, Ireland, therefore, was no longer wretched and down-trodden, but well fed, gaining in wealth, with a sense of well-being. So it was before the war; and after the war, and throughout the war, Ireland was prosperous as few other countries, and suffered none of the privations which came to England. At a time when middle-class English households were strictly rationed, when middle-class English mothers were standing in long queues in the dark, wet days, to get their allowances of meat or groceries, when milk was difficult to get for babes, when butter could not be got, and eggs had disappeared, the Irish folk had all these good things in rich abun-

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

dance. Their imports jumped up, from seventy-three million pounds sterling in 1914, to a hundred and twenty-six million pounds in 1918, and their exports from seventy-seven million pounds sterling in 1914 to a hundred and fifty-two millions in 1918. In 1916 the value of cattle and beef exported from Ireland to Great Britain far exceeded the value imported from any other country. From Ireland it amounted to £20,580,000; from the Argentine, £12,785,000, and from the United States, £3,520,000. As an exporter of bacon, hams, pork, and pigs, Ireland stood second to the United States. Her exports of poultry and eggs to Great Britain were higher than those from any other country. In butter she stood second to Denmark, and in oats third to the United States and the Argentine. Her increase in private wealth during the years of war is shown to some extent by the Irish Bank deposits, which were £61,955,000 in 1914, and £91,361,000 in 1917.

Nobody in England begrudges Ireland this advance in prosperity. It does not pay back for centuries of poverty due to misrule, and for many extortions of Anglo-Irish lords and gentlemen. But at least it is a proof that the evil regime had ended and that Ireland was well on the road to national welfare. They had no need to whine about their misery, for they were not miserable.

I, for one, however, understand that material well-being is not the greatest thing in life, and that the satisfaction of national sentiment, racial pride, liberty of self-government, are desires of the human heart stronger and nobler, if nobly expressed, than wealth or comfort. The Irish were still denied their old claim to rule themselves as a separate people, and material progress did not weaken, but rather strengthened, their passion for political liberty; and the European war, which intensified all ideals, hopes, fears, hatreds, and



## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

other emotions of men and women in the whole world, caused a profound stirring up of passion in Ireland.

### VI

Before this happened, other things had happened which were fatal links in the chain of Irish tragedy. A Home Rule Act (limited and imperfect, it is true) had at last been placed upon the statute book, after more than half a century of political strife, and Ulster had refused to acknowledge it.

The history of that half century of struggle in the House of Commons by a solid block of Irish members, under leaders like Parnell and Redmond, preceding that Act by Asquith's government, is too long and complicated to summarize, and is anyhow the record of a dismal and depressing drama. The Irish Nationalists had to fight against a dead weight of English prejudice throughout the Victorian era, which seemed invincible in its smugness and self-complacency, unbreakable in its intolerance and arrogance. The Queen herself symbolized, in a royal way, the narrow bigotry of the English middle class, which only broadened and mellowed to Liberal ideas when the Education Act of 1870 and other enlightening influences had begun to operate. The new imperialism of the Cecil Rhodes type, popularized by Kipling, made a political creed by Chamberlain, helped later to create an atmosphere of intolerance toward Irish claims for self-government. Religious prejudice acted also against Irish interests, for the Protestant cry of "No Popery" still had power to stir popular passion and to raise votes against any concessions to a Catholic people, lest Home Rule should spell Rome Rule, with the Inquisition at work again, with new Bartholomew massacres, with Jesuits in disguise conspiring against the Protestant Crown, and

agosticism reflected in  
*Elsmere* by Mrs. Hum  
science, and a wider kno  
of Irish members in the H  
decade after decade by t  
existing in the mass  
England; and their own  
regard of English sensibl  
the Celtic temperament  
even dimly apprehend, de  
time and time again. In  
the fire of his spirit, his  
tion of Liberal minds, c  
fears which belonged to  
of the English people in  
Ireland. Yet by a curiou  
of caste stronger than reli  
Catholics of the old aristo  
to Irish Home Rule as  
Puritan type.

One fatality dogged the  
alists to obtain victory  
and over again their char  
of crime committed by a



## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

hedgerow murders and sinister conspiracies of Moonlighters and Fenians hardened the English mind against any measure of Home Rule, made them stubborn against a plea for liberty by a people who used American dollars to organize assassination, cattle maiming, and boycotting.

Another source of anger and of political hatred against the Irish Nationalists was the manner in which their block in the House of Commons used their voting powers as a threat or as a bribe to English political parties. The Irish vote could turn out a government or wreck a bill which had nothing to do with Irish interests, and with relentless strategy the Irish leaders made use of this power whenever it suited their purpose, utterly indifferent to the welfare of the English people. That, at least, was a nagging thought among our politicians, though it is doubtful whether the Irish party thwarted any important measures which lay outside the interests of Ireland. Be that as it may, there were many people who cried out to be rid of that hostile, alien group on the Irish benches, with their cynical wit and mocking laughter, so that we ourselves might enjoy Home Rule for England.

It was John Redmond, as leader of the Nationalists, who at last succeeded in securing a majority in the House of Commons for Irish Home Rule, so winning victory, it seemed, after the long and uphill struggle.

That was after something like a political revolution in England, which, with the help of the Irish votes, had destroyed the veto of the House of Lords by pressure brought to bear upon the King to create sufficient peers to overthrow them if they did not surrender their own power. They surrendered at the eleventh hour, and as one of the first fruits of victory for the Liberals in the Commons, the Home Rule bill became law. But two things happened to spill these fruits out of the basket

happened in Ulster before  
bill. What happened the  
passions and bigotries of  
Smith (who is now Lord  
cellor of England), and  
rebel army whose avowed  
of Parliament by force  
authority, and, if need  
true that they proclaimed  
which flaunted across a  
vincing in its patriotism.  
be ruled by the Kaiser  
In view of what happened  
ence to the Kaiser was at  
hard now to remember the  
gled into Ulster for the  
mostly of German manuf

I saw a good deal of Be  
I saw I did not like. I saw  
among the leaders of the  
fellow Irishmen of Cathol  
by its mingled quality of  
fanaticism. One decade  
had passed (and the FIVE

## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

in better language, by Oliver Cromwell himself—stuff belonging to the old, dark bigotries of the Thirty Years' War or the Rise of the Dutch Republic; stuff of ignorance, of hatred, and of cruelty which left me aghast, because I believed we had passed beyond all that. This verbosity of intolerance was translated into acts, as I saw with my own eyes in back streets of Belfast and in the neighborhood of Queen's Island, where Protestant laborers fell upon Catholic workingmen and kicked them to death, or bruised and battered them so that the hospitals were busy with these casualties. At that time, anyhow, the Catholic Irish were not the aggressors, nor in places where there were Protestant minorities did they take vengeance by reprisals.

In March of 1914 a large consignment of arms was landed at Larne without let or hindrance from government officials, thereby persuading John Redmond to encourage recruiting of his own volunteers. But when in July the Irish volunteers tried to distribute arms they were opposed by troops who afterward fired on an unarmed crowd in Dublin.

After the swearing of the "Covenant," the drilling of battalions, and the establishment of a "Provisional Government" by the Ulster leaders, there happened the incident at the Curragh when Gough and other cavalry officers gave clear notice that they would refuse to obey orders if they were called upon to disarm the Ulster volunteers. If any man was a rebel, Carson was a rebel. If any body of men were conspiring with armed forces to defeat the authority of the Crown and Parliament, those men were the Ulster volunteers. Yet no action was taken against Sir Edward Carson or his riflemen, though a search was made for arms in southern Ireland when the Catholics raised their own volunteers in defense of the threats of war by Ulster.

The Great War came, and for a time washed out all





of their troops fr  
by her armed sor  
the armed Cathol  
join with the an  
It was the grea  
tween Great Brit  
we had would ha  
spirit of Ireland, w  
ment as a sister  
at the War Office  
plans of Irish rec  
playing up to Ul  
Catholic Irish wan  
under their own flag  
Why not, in God's  
were drafted into  
were not allowed  
offers of raising bod  
Even Lloyd George  
aghast at the metho  
and confessed that i  
been at work. He c  
fluences were the wor  
The first free of

## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

of partisanship with those who had sworn to resist Home Rule. On our side it was a colossal blunder, worse than a crime, and showed an ignorance of Irish psychology only equal to the German ignorance of our own.

Meanwhile a hundred thousand Catholic Irish were fighting for the liberty of civilization and for the safety of Great Britain. At first they believed that they were fighting also for the liberty of their own little isle, but gradually that belief left them and they were sadder and wiser men. Yet they went on fighting, gallantly, desperately, in the Dardanelles, on the western front, in Palestine, cut off from their own folk, reinforced by drafts from English battalions, commanded by officers not of their faith or race.

I was often with the troops of the 16th Irish Division in France and Flanders, because I wanted to give them what honor I could, by recording their valor and their loyalty at a time when they felt isolated from their own folk and from ours. They played their pipes for me in old French barns outside of Arras, and these Irish lads made whimsical jokes about the Jerry boys, as they called the Germans, and about their way of life and death. I remember one boy sitting in the straw below the rafters of a barn, who told me in a fine brogue that the place swarmed with rats who sat up on their hind legs and sang "God save Ireland"—"And sure," he said, "it's the truth I'm after telling you!" I saw them go into battle at Guillemont and Guinchy "when the Jerry boys ran so fast you couldn't see their tails for dust," and come out again across the shell-ravaged fields through the roar of guns, with all their officers gone, and sergeants or corporals leading little groups of tired, staggering men who were the few that were left out of the strong companies that had marched into that hell on earth. I stood by the side of their brigadier,

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

not an Irishman, but a lover of these boys in his command, and the tears ran down his face as he shouted words of praise to them.

"Bravo, Connaughts! Bravo, Munsters! You did damn well, Dublins!"

At the sight of him standing there, at those words of his, they pulled themselves up, turned eyes left, were glad of this tribute to a heroism not surpassed in the "war to end war," as we called it in our simplicity.

The Irish division did not get a fair deal. It was left in the trenches month after month, shifted from one part of the line to another, without a rest, and in August of 1917, in Flanders, up against the German pill boxes at "Beck House" and "Borry Farm" it was just a massacre. They were alongside the Ulster men, who shared their sacrifice, and with whom they were comrades, forgetful, there, in France and Flanders, of political and religious feuds, but Irishmen together. Left for three weeks in ditches of death, under a ceaseless storm of German gunfire, each of these two Irish divisions lost nearly two thousand men and over a hundred and fifty officers before they were sent "over the top" in a great assault. And then without mercy for their losses they were pushed into a battle which cost them another two thousand men for each division, and almost the last of their officers. Some of their battalions lost 64, and even 66 per cent of their fighting strength. Some companies were almost annihilated. It was not war. It was a murder of men who fought to the extreme limits of human heroism in impossible conditions and in obedience to outrageous orders.

For General Hickey, their divisional commander, I had a warm regard. He had a charming Irish way and was proud of his men, but I think he failed in getting fair play for them and allowed them to be used too

## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

ruthlessly by our High Command. Both divisions were remade by scraping up drafts of men from convalescent camps and from English depots. In the German offensive of 1918 they were holding the line in the Fifth Army front, and fought again until they were almost destroyed. On the outskirts of Amiens, after a terrible week against the overwhelming tide, General Nugent, commanding the Ulster division, was asked by a French general coming up to our relief, to make another attack while the French troops detrained. General Nugent's answer to the message was a revelation of his tragedy. "Tell your general," he said, "that I have only three hundred men who can stand up"—three hundred out of a whole division!—"but they will attack again."

Any man who denies the valor of the Irish in the war is a liar. They had not the same discipline as the English (their temperament was different), some of their officers were not so well trained, but their courage was magnificent and their spirit heroic. As an Englishman, I am glad to pay them this tribute in truth and honesty, and especially because, in Ireland, that rebellion in Easter week of 1916, before the battles of the Somme, before their agony in those fields and in Flanders, cut them off from their own people and put them to a supreme test of loyalty.

### VIII

For that rebellion there is no excuse. Not even the tragic heritage of Irish history, nor our own stupidities in dealing with a temperamental people, nor Carson's sinister influence, palliates the black treachery of that act. It was treachery not only against the English people, who, whatever the acts of their government, had been patient with Ireland, generously inclined,

and there would have been  
Pickelhauben for Irish rebels  
believe in rebels when they  
He has a short way with them  
would have been broken  
would not have helped Ireland  
poverty-stricken with us,  
yoke of a real tyranny.  
ness as well as badness.

Of the complicity of the  
enemy there is no doubt.  
the only man in correspondence  
Irish-Americans and Count  
the leaders of the rebellion  
German government. This  
upon German assistance, a  
letter written the night before

The help I expected from German  
ships.

Judge Cohalan in the United States  
Bernstorff to forward the  
German Foreign Office:



## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

It might then be possible to close the Irish harbors against England, set up bases for submarines, and cut off food export to England. A successful rising may decide the war.

John Devoy was the leader of the revolutionary plot in the United States, and in close and constant communication with the German ambassador at Washington. On February 18, 1916, Count Bernstorff attached the following message surreptitiously to a note regarding the *Lusitania* negotiations, sanctioned and passed through by the State Department of the American government:

The Irish leader, John Devoy, informs me that rising is to begin in Ireland on Easter Sunday. Please send arms to (arrive at) Limerick, west coast of Ireland, between Good Friday and Easter Sunday. To put it off longer is impossible. Let me know if help may be expected from Germany.

BERNSTORFF.

There is one mitigating fact in the indictment of the Irish people regarding the rebellion which broke out in Dublin during that Easter week and led to the death of many English soldiers, many Irish boys, hundreds of casualties on both sides, the destruction of the best part of Dublin from artillery fire, and the abomination of martial law. Its outbreak was bitterly condemned and resented by the majority of Irish citizens, who regarded it, for the first day or two at least, as an act of criminal madness. From many sources of information, English as well as Irish, I have evidence of that. But when its failure was assured and large numbers of Irish lads and their leaders were surrounded by superior forces and strong artillery, without a dog's chance of escape, sentiment was intensely stirred and every Irish heart bled at the thought of their inevitable death unless they surrendered. Whatever the original folly or crime, all people must feel like that for their fellow

bloody Assizes  
death, and exe  
countries, those  
ison with what  
Germany, France  
we were mild in p  
merciful we shoul  
like Pearse, Mac  
men in their natur  
thing. They were  
visionaries, though  
We might have k  
make martyrs of th  
people would be flu  
ists by their tragic  
for Ireland, by the tr  
to execution. It is  
makes great statesm  
eral Maxwell has as n  
German drill sergean  
Our own statesmen w  
not brave enough to ri  
They went by the bo  
stood by "the need of  
have quoted Shakespea





## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

From the lowest point of view, the low cunning of tactical strategy, we should have done better to have put those men in prison for a while, to have treated them with chivalry, as now and again in the past English kings treated rebellious subjects, and then have called the heart of Ireland for loyalty on generous terms. General Botha dealt with the rebellion of De Wet in the early days of the war. For the leaders there were short terms of imprisonment, then a general amnesty. "We want to put that out of our memories," he said. That way might have failed in Ireland, for the Irish are a Celtic people and many of them are not easily forgetful of what they think is unfair and are cynical of generous dealing, which they mistake for weakness, and are incurably suspicious. Mercy might have failed to win their thanks. But lack of mercy was bound to fail. It did fail most horribly. The most moderate men and women in Ireland revolted against the "martyrdom" of the Sinn Fein leaders, and the Irish Republican Army, the Irish volunteers now called themselves, received recruits from the great body of Irish youth. On the northern front many Irish soldiers, still fighting for us, deserted themselves anew to Irish freedom, and during the war, if they had the luck, or misfortune, to have joined the ranks of the rebel forces.

Conciliatory attempts were made by Mr. Asquith, in the first months of his office as Prime Minister, to reshape the government of Ireland, and he appointed Lloyd George to negotiate with John Redmond and Sir Edward Carson, in order that the first principles of a new bill might be agreed upon. Redmond obtained a written agreement which outlined the government proposals, setting up an Irish Parliament, with a responsible executive, and arranging to leave out the six counties of Ulster during the war, upon the ending of which the problem of partition would be raised again





... of Redme  
interpreted the g  
permanent partiti  
diated the bindin  
Irish leader, so th  
own people would  
and would repudiat  
The war was stil  
in England, Scotlan  
ical strife in Irelan  
and deadened by th  
ter in France and F  
left of rapid victory  
with their long deat.  
to get in sight of an  
more men, and still  
Intrigue was rife at l  
ment, and criticism o  
to belief that a chang  
chance of victory. E  
Bonar Law and Lloyd  
a Canadian journalist  
Lord Beaverbrook—as  
unseated and Lloyd Ge  
the Coalition, dependen  
Bonar Law with



## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

Lloyd George had great qualities of leadership which might have made him more powerful than those who kept the rein upon his finer instincts. He had imagination, sympathy, generous impulses, splendid audacity, revealed from time to time in spite of all those hide-bound pettifogging brains which surrounded him closely and watchfully and suspiciously, and whose power over other people of their kind was able to thwart him or change his direction, whenever he tried to be free of them.

So it was in his dealings with Ireland. His first action was maganimous and he set free large numbers of young Irishmen who had been imprisoned since the rebellion of Easter week in 1916, though he refused to annul the sentences of those who were in penal servitude. But when Sinn Fein began to win by-elections—Count Plunkett being elected for Roscommon in February 1917—he allowed himself to be influenced by the fears of his supporters and gave his consent to a new campaign of coercion, with wholesale arrests, house-to-house searches, imprisonment without trial, and all the rigors of military rule. In the House of Commons Major Willie Redmond made a moving and noble appeal for peaceful settlement by a quick and generous measure of self-government for Ireland. “In the name of God, we here, who are perhaps about to die, ask you to do that which largely induced us to leave our homes.”

I read that speech of Major Redmond's, much stirred by its pathos, when I was recording the daily routine of the war, and three months later, when I went among the Irish battalions on a great day of battle at Messines, I remembered his words, when an Irish soldier told me that “Major Willie” had been killed not far from where I stood, by Wytschaete Wood. A few days later I was present at his graveside in a convent garden when soldiers of Protestant Ulster and Catholic Ireland fired the last salute above his dust. He had died like many

convention was summoned for the purpose of the self-government of Ireland. The various parties of the Irish people were represented, having names of their own.

All through the autumn the people became more and more excited, as news reached them of the progress of the movement. The cause was as noble as ever, and would lead to separation, for the sake of the people, under the chairmanship of a man who was devoted, and patriotic Irishman. It represented all shades of opinion, from the extreme to the moderate. Among its members were the Ulster Unionists, three Roman Catholic bishops, two bishops of the Church of Ireland, thirty-one chairmen of county councils, eight urban councilors, and such great Irishmen as Lord MacDowell, Lord De Viscount, and the provost of Trinity College.

They could not agree. But the movement was not to be crushed. It resigned, and died of soul. It was sent to Lloyd George and



## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

and there is hardly a doubt that even then a full promise of Dominion Home Rule for Ireland, with a temporary arrangement for Ulster, would have received the allegiance of the great majority of Irish people, if it had been made without reservation and as a great act of reconciliation and justice by the British government. But the British government ignored the points of agreement in the report, the common bond of national sentiment that united all but the Ulster group, and Lloyd George put all the work of the convention on one side, as a failure from which there was nothing to be learned. He earned nothing, not even the unanimous conviction of the subcommittee on national defense that, after all that had happened, there could be no conscription in Ireland without the consent of an Irish Parliament. After the German offensive of 1918 he announced that conscription would be extended to Ireland, and there was not a single party in that island, hardly an individual, who did not regard that statement as the final breaking of all pledges and as an outrageous insult to Irish pride. For as a people they would not allow their men to be taken without the consent of their own National Assembly, as though they were but slaves of the English who denied them the rights of common freedom.

It is hard for the English people, even now, to understand that point of view. We keep on harping on the fact that Ireland "belongs" to England. We have in our bones the feeling that the Irish and the English are blood relations, united under the King, with the same interests, the same duties, the same loyalties. In the war, when the best of our manhood was being sent to the shambles, it seemed black treachery or cowardice that Irish youth should escape scot free while ours was fighting for "the liberty of the world." Even now, the majority of people in England hold that view,

Again one must  
the intrigues, trick  
and irreconcilable  
stand the fire of it  
at that threat of  
as one man to re  
Dublin representa  
party, Sinn Fein,  
conference, and on  
declaration:

Taking our stand on  
hood, and affirming the p  
nations derive their just  
we deny the right of the Br  
to impose compulsory mil  
expressed will of the Irish  
bill by the British House  
ration of war on the Irisl  
as such is to surrender o  
slaves. It is in direct vi  
to self-determination, wh  
—now preparing to emp  
upon Ireland—himself a  
peace at the Peace Congr  
warrantable aggression

## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

that conscription is an oppressive and inhuman law which the Irish people have a right to resist by every means that are consonant with the law of God.

The British government did not try to enforce conscription in Ireland in face of this storm of popular indignation, but from that time forward they turned the screw of martial law with ever-increasing severity.

In 1918 there were over eleven hundred arrests, and several Irishmen had been bayoneted or shot for resisting arrest or trying to escape, while others had died in prison. Up to the end of that year only one policeman had been killed. British officers, and the Royal Irish Constabulary acting under their orders, were intolerant of Irish sentiment, customs, and free speech, behaving with oppressive attempts to break the spirit of the people, which had the effect of hardening that spirit into a cold hatred and contempt of English "tyranny." It was tyranny, as we must confess, done, not by the will of the English people, who were utterly ignorant of what was happening in Ireland, owing to the boycott of Irish news in a bought or partisan press, but by military and police officials with the narrow intelligence, the pride in a little brief authority, the exaggerated sense of "discipline," and the spirit of "We'll teach 'em what's what!" which are characteristic qualities of many professional soldiers and of all police.

Men were arrested and imprisoned for "offenses" of the most trivial kind, or for mere political opinions. For being in possession of Sinn Fein literature, for reading, or listening to, political manifestoes they were sentenced to years of captivity. Boys and girls were imprisoned for "whistling derisively" at the police (just as French and Belgian boys and girls were imprisoned by the Germans for mocking at the "goose step"), or for singing old Irish songs, or speaking the Irish language. Small crowds of farmers, with their women folk,



...ember,  
Ireland which re  
Nationalists of th  
side, and only sev  
seventy-three seat  
at Westminster, b  
called Dail Eirann.  
to administer the  
they proceeded to  
genius, and a respec  
which astonished a  
people were incapai  
brains in Ireland, th  
magistrates, served  
merable disputes in  
advantage to the I  
evidence we have. I  
to a system of traini  
have been adapted  
Rule, still promised b  
ment increased their n  
innumerable raids, hot  
for the purpose of br  
of the Republican lea

## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

Ireland would be given a hearing, and admitted by the great Powers, especially by the United States of America. Through the influence of Irish-Americans great pressure was brought to bear upon President Wilson, and Irish emissaries dogged the precincts of Versailles, with urgent pleas to obtain a hearing. It was of course impossible for Great Britain to put the case of Ireland on to the conference table. It would have been a surrender of pride and a confession of impotence which her people would not tolerate for a second, even in imagination. Only the simplicity of the Irish mind, simple even with all its shrewdness and its cunning, could have hoped for such a surrender—in the days of England's victory. It is foolish to ask something beyond the bounds of human nature as it is now constituted, and that was one thing. Lloyd George merely smiled at such audacity, or was impatient at the mention of it. President Wilson bluntly told his Irish-Americans that that question belonged to Great Britain's domestic politics, and could not be touched by other Powers.

Yet the high-sounding phrases on the lips of our statesmen during the peace discussions were but a mockery so long as Ireland remained under martial law, and the more honest men at least who related their phrases to their deeds, and who were touched by the inspiration of victory which after long agony and a heritage of ruin promised the beginning of a new chapter in the history of the world, would have put themselves right with their conscience by a magnanimous settlement in Ireland. There was no magnanimity. While there was talk of a more generous measure of Home Rule, and houses were being searched for arms in Catholic Ireland (but never one in Protestant Ireland), Sir Edward Carson went to Ireland and threatened to renew his rebellion if the government brought in a Home Rule bill of which he did not approve. He was not arrested



governance (with a  
broke in them an  
opened, and out of t  
spirit of vengeance,



It was the begin  
worse even than mo  
because of its mora  
individual cruelties,  
children, its effect u  
forces, its red Indian  
in the "Irish Repub  
were not distinguisha  
and carried out their  
ning rather than by c  
were upon the Royal  
regarded as the agent  
and informers. One l  
dogs, without a dog  
British government ti  
of death by unlimited  
Q. "



## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

that year, abandoning all policy of reconciliation, the British government passed an Act which took away all civil rights from the Irish people. Courts-martial were established, civil inquests were abandoned; any Irish man, woman, or child could be arrested on suspicion, and imprisoned without trial, for holding political opinions with which British officers did not agree, for belonging to societies which upheld the Irish claim to self-government, for any act or word or gesture, or the absence of any act or word, to the annoyance of any patrol of military or police, drunk or sober. That was not the legal wording of the Act, but those were the powers it gave and the powers that were used.

The policy of coercion was intrusted by the British government to the Chief Secretary, Sir Hamar Greenwood, a Canadian Jew, who in my judgment has done more to dishonor the British Empire than any living man. He owed his position to that group of interests led by Lord Beaverbrook (formerly Max Aitken of Canada) with the approval of Bonar Law and the sanction of Lloyd George, and he held it by a bluff, breezy, John Bull manner, which was the camouflage of craft, and by a courage and obstinacy in a dangerous policy which was the admiration of Tory minds with Prussian instincts, while he astonished and delighted them by his blank denials of undeniable evidence, his utter contempt for criticism and rebuke, his audacious handling of truth, his superb refusal to be intimidated by accusations of dishonor, lying, brutality, and connivance with crime. In Ireland, General Macready, old and artful in war and civil strife, was put in command of military operations, and General Tudor, who has the soul of a Welsh chieftain in the eleventh century, was made responsible for the police, including a special body of volunteers, recruits from the unemployed soldiers of the Great War, at a high rate of pay, and known by

though dangerous, g  
a district away from  
for a military conv  
whom they were c  
Irish chemists had  
would blow a lorry  
of soldiers. I am tol  
those used in the Eu  
Irish "barracks"—ge  
washed building, con  
they isolated first by  
approach and cutting  
small stores of arms, a  
and they were able to  
stores of arms.

Their "Intelligence"  
their recruits in every  
every post office, at ev  
government buildings,  
By clever strategy a  
they captured many m  
activities of British  
private individuals. A



## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

victed and shot. I. R. A." as a warning to others of his kind. They shot some of their own women for "conversation" with the enemy, or cut off their hair in the market place, as I saw women treated in Belgium for the same offense with Germans. No enemy of theirs was safe, eating or drinking, praying or sleeping, indoors or out, with wife and children or with fellow worshippers in church. Into lonely farmhouses broke parties of masked men, to drag out some trembling fellow, in spite of the shrieks of his women folk, to shoot him in the back yard, or, if he struggled, in the presence of his wife and children. A British officer, retired after the European war, sat at table with his wife in a house near Dublin. As usual, his revolver lay ready at his elbow. It was the wife who noticed movements of men first. The husband had time to raise his hand and dodge as two men came in and fired. His hand received the bullet, and he shot his enemy through the stomach. The wife seized the other man by the throat and grabbed his revolver. He fled after a second of struggle, and the husband and wife escaped that night from Ireland, more lucky than others. More lucky, for instance, than the unfortunate officers who were billeted in Dublin and murdered in their bedrooms in the presence of their wives. . . . If women were in the way, there was no mercy for them, at least in the case of an officer named Blake, who had been playing tennis with a friend until dark, and then joined two ladies in a motor car. After a short drive, he got down to open a park gate, and as he did so a party of men leaped out and shot him. One of the ladies (who was expecting a child) flung herself between the assassins and the second officer, and shared his fate, which was death. The other lady was allowed to escape. Such incidents were not rare.

Inspired by a cold hatred of any man in British

... cause, young men  
engaged in this red Irish  
human pity, no softness  
came to the killing of  
the execution of me  
because in courts-martial  
rebels to death.

These Irish boys run  
quarters, and obeyed  
they disobeyed they were  
and traitors. By all means  
have been boys among  
fight, who hated the thought  
gentle lads, taught to  
Christ—and I am told  
agonized when the secret  
part, as I am told also to  
to go into "action," in  
ambush, grim, resolute,  
attack, and heroic in the  
sake, as they believed,  
hanged in jail.

These boys were in  
by many of their women  
who regarded them as  
justified in the right of



## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

caught in an ambush, they rebuked their judges—British officers of courts-martial—for killing their prisoners. And theoretically there was logic in those answers, as British officers I know admit. But the logic of this kind of war is devil's logic. Not even for liberty's sake is the killing of men in cold blood or before their women folk justified. Not even savage warfare could be more cruel than some of the acts committed by the I. R. A., like the assassination of officers on leave in Dublin.

The spirit of it belongs to the Paleolithic Age, and is not to be reconciled with the Christian faith by any casuistry, though Catholic priests gave it their blessing and inspired its action by their own ardor. Now and again some of their bishops protested against the horror of this way of war and denounced it in solemn words.

In his Advent pastoral, Cardinal Logue wrote the following words referring to the murder of fifteen officers in Dublin:

The tragedies of last Sunday have oppressed me with a deep sense of sadness and a feeling akin to despair. I have never hesitated to condemn, in the strongest terms at my command, such deeds of blood, from whatever source they may have sprung. I believe that every man and woman in Ireland who retains a spark of Christian feeling, or even the instincts of humanity, deplores, detests, and condemns the cold-blooded murders of Sunday morning. No object could excuse them; no motive could justify them; no heart, unless hardened and steeled against pity, could tolerate their cruelty. Patriotism is a noble virtue when it pursues its object by means that are sincere, honorable, just, and in strict accordance with God's law; otherwise it degenerates into a blind, brutal, reckless passion, inspired not by love of country, but by Satan, "who was a murderer from the beginning." The perpetrators of such crimes are not real patriots, but the enemies of their country, robbing her of just sympathy and raising obstacles to her progress and impressing a deep stain on her fair fame.

The cardinal also condemned in the same pastoral the general, indiscriminate massacre of innocent and

in revenge again for the  
sector of the most pros

On December 12, 1904  
Bishop of Cork, issued  
ambushes, kidnapping  
besides the guilt invol  
their opposition to the  
within the diocese of C  
ambush, or in kidnap  
guilty of murder or att  
by the very act, the cens

In the course of his se  
Cohalan said it was a s  
man from behind a scr  
there was no danger to th  
leaving aside the moral  
moment, what has the  
the murder of policeme  
of such and such districts  
from British sway when  
barracks burned. It w  
would now mention any c  
from British rule by the  
Constabularies



## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

it was like a devil's competition between some members of the Republicans and agents of the Crown, in feats of murder and arson. Recently ambushes had taken place with serious loss of life, and he would say this about ambushes (leaving out of the question for the moment their moral aspect)—the ambushers come to a place from no one knows where, and when their work is done they depart to no one knows what destination. There is not much risk to the ambushers personally, but by this time boys or men taking part in ambushes must know that by their criminal acts they are exposing perhaps a whole countryside, perhaps a town or city, to the danger of terrible reprisals; that when they depart and disperse in safety they are leaving the lives and property of a number of innocent people unprotected and undefended, to the fury of reprisals at the hands of servants of the government. Then, over and above all, there was the moral aspect of these ambushes. Let there be no doubt about it—there was no doubt about it—that these ambushers were murderers, and every life taken in an ambush was a murder. Notwithstanding repeated condemnations of murder, and repeated warning, terrible murders had been committed these past few weeks. As a result of the ambush the previous night at Dillon's Cross, the city had suffered, the bishop thought, as much damage at the hands of the servants of the government as Dublin had suffered during the rebellion of 1916. It was all very well to talk of the city of Cork being under the care and solicitude of the Republican Army. The city was nearly a ruin, and the ruin had followed on the murderous ambush at Dillon's Cross. If any section or member of the volunteer organization refused to hear the Church's teaching about murder, there was no remedy but the extreme remedy of excommunication from the Church, and the bishop said he would certainly issue a decree ex-



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

communicating anyone who, after that notice, should take part in an ambush or in kidnapping, or otherwise should be guilty of murder or attempted murder, or arson.

The bishop concluded by asking the congregation to pray that God in His mercy would vouchsafe an honorable peace which would of itself be an effective means of putting an end to crime and re-establishing order.

Those pastoral denunciations fell on deaf ears, not without consequences which the Catholic Church in Ireland will rue for many a long day, as for the first time in history Irishmen in great numbers broke free from the authority of their ecclesiastical leaders, and denied their right to interfere in this political and national struggle by any religious call to obedience and discipline.

### X

That is one side of the picture. Sinn Fein murders, ambushes, and raids, the blowing up of trains, the burning down of old mansions, the terrorism of armed and secret bands undistinguished by any sign or badge among ordinary civilians, unless they were caught red-handed.

There is another side, and in all honesty we must bring it to the light of truth. The forces of "law and order" in Ireland, above all that force known as the Black-and-Tans (because of black belts on khaki tunics), under General Tudor, committed acts exactly like those of the Sinn Fein "gunmen," not more justified. A famous case which could not be hushed up was the murder of Mr. McCurtain, Lord Mayor of Cork, by masked men who killed him at dead of night before his wife's eyes. In spite of all government denials there is little doubt in the public mind, both in Ireland and in England, that the Lord Mayor was the victim of a police



## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

reprisal. That was only one of many less-known cases. This guerrilla warfare became a vendetta like that of Sicilian bandits. The Sinn Feiners killed a British soldier or policeman. To revenge his death, British troops or police—mostly General Tudor's "lions"—killed the first Sinn Feiners they could lay hands on. A British patrol was ambushed near a village. Shortly afterward troops would appear in lorries shooting up the street, spraying bullets from machine guns, and at their leisure burning a few houses, the local stores, or the creamery. Men would be dragged out of their beds and shot, young boys would be battered in their back yards, and women frightened out of their wits by midnight raids.

Then the next chapter would begin. Those troops would be marked down, their officers identified by private letters captured in the mails, and there would be fresh ambushes, fresh murders, leading to more reprisals, more raids, more burnings, and the "accidental" shooting of women standing at their shop doors, children playing in the village street, old men working in their fields, young men who ran away when called to halt, knowing that if they halted they would, as likely as not, be shot or bayoneted or clubbed—innocent or guilty.

I can understand the psychology of our men, as I imagine (perhaps quite falsely) that I understand the psychology of the Sinn Feiners, though I loathe their way of war. It is indeed easy to understand the mentality of a body of young British soldiers or "Black-and-Tans," sent to a district in Ireland. In the beginning they thought it was going to be "a soft job." They had visions of a brush or two with Irish rebels who would then be good boys and see the folly of their game, up against tanks, machine guns, and well-trained troops who had been through the Great War. There would be flirtations with pretty Irish lasses, plenty of milk in the

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

farmhouses, a gay time in Dublin or Cork, and friendly greetings on the "long, long way to Tipperary." . . .

What was the reality? They found themselves in a hostile population in which there were enemies who might kill them if they walked alone, by a shot in the back at the next turn of the road, between the village stores and the post office, at the corner of a country lane, at any time of the day or night. Whichever way they looked, they saw hostile eyes staring at them, eyes with hatred in them, eyes which had a menace of death. If they spoke to a pretty girl she did not smile, like the girls in France, but became pale with fear or red with anger. There was a sense of menace always about them. Out of a crowd in a market place there might come a group of men to shoot them down like dogs when they were buying picture postcards. Presently they were not allowed to go about, except in military formation or in armored cars and lorries. They were cooped up in barracks where they could drink as much as they liked. There was nothing to do except drink and play cards, until night came and they were ordered to form search parties. They were taught their duty. General Tudor gave lectures to his officers about the short way with rebels. The officers passed the word on to the men. There was no sentiment about it. No gentle chivalry! . . .

Passion took hold of them at times. A favorite comrade had been shot in a lonely place. They had been sniped as they passed down a village street. A mess of flesh and blood was all that was left of some pals in a lorry proceeding up a country road near a lonely farmhouse or wayside inn or little Irish town. Where was the enemy? Nowhere—and everywhere. How could one distinguish between innocent and guilty? They were all guilty—"Sinn Fein up to the neck," as the British soldier said. "Give them a taste of their own



## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

poison!" . . . So reprisals happened. They were as logical as hell—but not a credit to the fame of England, or Scotland, not in our old code of honor, not good for publication.

The only place in which they were not reported for publication was in the newspaper press of Great Britain. Mr. Lloyd George's newspaper friends did not like to hurt his feelings. Other papers did not like to hurt the feelings of readers more interested in our nobility of ideals or our divorce-court cases. Questions were asked in the House, and Sir Hamar Greenwood showed his quality in answering them. He first denied all accusations blankly and firmly. Reprisals? Certainly not! Never! No such thing! Sinn Fein propaganda! General Tudor's young gentlemen were noble fellows—heroes of the Great War. He could find no evidence at all—after careful inquiry—for any alleged acts of violence.

In every country in the world Sinn Fein was reporting tragic episodes, shocking misdeeds, by men wearing British uniforms, arousing the suspicion or horror of our friends, the hatred of our enemies. But in England for a long time we heard nothing but Sinn Fein atrocities, in full detail. The English people were unable to obtain evidence of things done to their dishonor, and it is to their credit that without such evidence they were slow to believe that British Ministers or British officers would connive at a policy of terrorism which violated all our best traditions. Presently ugly facts did begin to thrust through the screen of silence. The representatives of some newspapers like the *Times*, the *Daily News*, and the *Manchester Guardian* were allowed by their editors to tell the things they had seen and the evidence they had gained. Mr. Hugh Martin, of the *Daily News*, was especially courageous in unmasking the truth, and his reports of the burning and sacking of

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

Irish villages, the flogging and battering of Irish boys, the shooting of civilians in cold blood by bodies of Black-and-Tans, and the terrorisation of Irish women in midnight raids by drunken or brutalized military police, could not be denied, excepting by Sir Hamar Greenwood.

One of the most notorious cases, not more terrible than many others, but less easy to conceal because a resident magistrate risked his life by giving evidence, was the murder of Canon Magner and Timothy Crowley. The facts, as officially admitted, were that at 1 P.M. on December 17, 1920, about thirty auxiliary police left Dunmanway, in two motor lorries, with a cadet named Hart in charge, to go to Cork to attend the funeral of one of their force who was recently shot dead at Cork. About a mile on the road they met Canon Magner, the seventy-three-year-old parish priest of Dunmanway, and Timothy Crowley, aged twenty-four, a farmer's son. The cadet in charge stopped the lorries, walked up to Timothy Crowley, asked him for a permit, and then shot him dead with his revolver. He then turned to the priest and, according to the evidence of one of the police, "started talking to him." Two other cadets went toward him, but he turned round, waving his revolver. While they were returning, Cadet Hart seized the hat from the priest's head and threw it on the ground and made him kneel down. He fired and wounded him, and then fired again, killing him. He went through the priest's pockets. Mr. Brady, the resident magistrate, who was a witness of the murder, was also threatened with death, but took cover and escaped. It was evident that Cadet Hart had been drinking heavily. He was arrested, and certified as "insane" by his superior officers.

In the House of Commons, on March 3, 1921, Commander Kenworthy asked Sir Hamar Greenwood whether he was aware that Mr. Brady, resident magistrate,



## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

resent at the murder of Crowley and Canon Magner, stated that the other cadets in the lorry made no attempt to interfere, that Mr. Brady's house was subsequently raided; whether Mr. Brady was called as a witness at the special investigation; whether these other cadets were punished in any way, and whether any of them are now employed in Ireland.

Sir Hamar Greenwood answered:

A written statement by Mr. Brady, setting out the full circumstances of the murder, was fully considered in the course of the official investigation into the conduct of the cadets who were witnesses of the occurrence. As a result of this investigation it was decided that these cadets were in no way responsible for the crime and that no action was called for in their case.

On March 19th, three months after the murder, Ministers were asked whether Mr. Brady's house had been raided by the auxiliaries, whether they had threatened him, and whether he had left the country on the advice of the right honorable gentleman's responsible officers.

Replying for Sir Hamar Greenwood, Mr. Henry would not deny this statement, but professed ignorance of the whereabouts of Mr. Brady, who had obtained leave of absence and was "broken down in nerves."

It was in September, 1920, that the burning and looting of Balbriggan drew national attention to a policy of reprisals that had already been in force and could no longer be denied by the British government. Lord Grey, Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Asquith, and Mr. Henderson called for an inquiry, and that was replied to indignantly by Mr. Lloyd George, who seemed to find singular amusement in the destruction of Irish creameries. Mr. Winston Churchill defended the conduct of the military and police in Ireland, and said that if the armed forces of the Crown were punished for their

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

conduct they would revolt. General Macready had already admitted that it was "a delicate and difficult matter" to punish men who, under his authority, did acts of indiscipline in the way of reprisals. Later, at Carnarvon, the Prime Minister of England admitted and defended reprisals in a speech of memorable brutality.

The Irish Catholic bishops issued a manifesto denouncing the reign of terror caused by reprisals as solemnly as they denounced the Sinn Fein warfare.

We know that latterly, at least, all pretense of strict discipline has been thrown to the winds and that those who profess to be the guardians of law and order have become the most ardent votaries of lawlessness and disorder; that they are running wild through the country, making night hideous by raids; that reckless and indiscriminate shootings in crowded places have made many innocent victims; that towns are sacked as in the rude warfare of earlier ages; that those who run through fear are shot at sight. . . . For all this not the men, but their masters, are chiefly to blame. It is not a question of hasty reprisals, which, however unjustifiable, might be attributed to extreme provocation, nor of quick retaliation on evildoers, nor of lynch law for miscreants—much less of self-defense of any kind whatsoever. It is an indiscriminate vengeance deliberately wreaked on a whole countryside, without any proof of its complicity in crime, by those who ostensibly are employed by the British government to protect the lives and property of the people and restore order in Ireland.

While this was happening, the Home Rule Act was annulled and a new and utterly inadequate measure was passed through Parliament, disregarding the advice, warning, and pleading of English Liberals and Irish Moderates. It divided Ireland into two nations, one with a population of three and a quarter millions, the other of one and a quarter, and there could not be a single legislature unless the majority agreed to give half the representation to the minority. That alone secured its condemnation by every Irishman in the



## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

th and West; neither Protestant Ulster nor Cath-  
: Ireland believed in it as a promise of peace.

### XI

All through the year of 1920 and half the year of 1921  
reign of terror continued in Ireland, with increasing  
hlessness on both sides, and with a complete aban-  
ment of statesmanship by the British government in  
or of what was called by the Lord Chancellor of  
gland, in sinister words, "The Reconquest of Ire-  
d"! Yet it was denied that we were at war with  
Irish people, until June, 1921, when the word "war"  
s used by Ministers in the House of Commons, not  
lessly, I think, but as a preparation of the public  
id for an intensive military campaign in Catholic  
land after the inauguration of the Ulster Parliament.  
ause we were not officially at war with the Irish peo-  
e, it was permissible to shoot or hang our captives as  
els and murderers, and not as prisoners of war.  
On November 1, 1920, a youth named Kevin Barry,  
tured in action, was hanged in Dublin. He met his  
th with a cheerful and heroic courage, while outside  
prison vast crowds of Irish people wept and prayed  
him.

On February 1, 1921, Cornelius Murphy was shot  
Cork for being in possession of a revolver and ammu-  
ion. On February 26th five Irish lads were shot at  
rk for "levying war." On February 28th another  
n was shot for "being improperly in possession  
a revolver and ammunition." On March 14th six  
n were hanged in batches at Dublin—two on a charge  
murder, and four on a charge of "high treason and  
ying war." Ten others followed to their death by  
oting or hanging in Dublin and Cork "for being  
properly in possession of arms and ammunition,"



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

a charge which would condemn the entire youth of Ireland to death, in Ulster (where no arrest was ever made on such a charge) as well as in the Catholic provinces.

There was no cessation of hostilities or of reprisals as the day came nearer when the Home Rule Act of 1920 was to be put into operation. It was known in advance that no single Sinn Fein member would attend the Southern Parliament, but the British were determined to set up the Ulster Parliament as a preliminary to "re-conquest" in the other parts.

On June 1st, only a few weeks before that new era in Irish history, Sir Hamar Greenwood made a speech on reprisals in Ireland, in which he made the following statement:

I have said at this bar time and again, in reference to reprisals, that no one tried more strenuously than I have to put them down, and I think I have succeeded in doing so.

Those words of his will become a mockery in history, for during his administration, which began on April 3, 1920, the "unofficial" and "official" reprisals increased at a monstrous rate. Whereas in April there were eleven buildings in Ireland wholly or partially destroyed, in May there were thirty-eight, in June twenty-four, in July two hundred and forty-four, in August two hundred and two, and in the first five months of 1921 over one thousand.

Sir Hamar Greenwood also said that in the non-martial law area, which comprises the great part of Ireland, there never have been official reprisals.

"Reprisals are rare. Unofficial reprisals are now rare indeed, so rare that we may say they never occur in Ireland." That statement, soothing to our British conscience, was immediately challenged by the Irish people, who issued the following rejoinder:

## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

### UNOFFICIAL REPRISALS IN THE NON-MARTIAL LAW AREA

The havoc in Headford, Co. Galway, on January 18th, 1920, and subsequent days when 19 residences, farmhouses and shops were destroyed, was only one of many "unofficial" reprisals in that month. The wrecking of Donegal town in which 100 shops and residences were destroyed or damaged occurred in February. The town of Clifden, Connemara, was sacked on March 16th. Sixteen buildings were wholly or partially destroyed in the town of Westport, Co. Mayo, on March 26th. During the month of April many residences, shops and other premises were destroyed in fifteen towns not in the Martial Law area. And in one week ending May 21st, ten farmhouses, seven private residences, four shops, two hotels, a granary and a mill were destroyed in the Non-martial Law counties of Galway, Mayo and Offaly (King's Co.).

### UNOFFICIAL REPRISALS IN THE MARTIAL LAW AREA

So much for some of the "Unofficial" reprisals, "so rare that we may say that they never occur." There are others. In the eight counties under Martial Law the number of buildings and property of all kinds destroyed "unofficially" by British forces was more than twice the number of the buildings and property officially destroyed. The following is a comparison covering the period January 1st, 1921, to May 28th, 1921, between the premises and property destroyed or damaged by order of the British Military Governors in the Martial Law area and those destroyed or damaged by roving bands of Constables and Troops. The phrase "Premises and Property" covers crops, furniture and personal effects, as well as shops, farmhouses, residences, public halls, factories and works:

Year 1921	Premises and property destroyed or damaged under official order	Premises and property destroyed or damaged unofficially
January.....	22	52
February.....	7	76
March.....	9	19
April.....	36	35
May (1st-28th).....	88	172
	<hr/> 162	<hr/> 354

The wholesale destruction of the houses of non-combatant Irish men and women, "officially" and

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

“unofficially”—and I can see no distinction in the evil of either method of collective punishment—failed to terrorize them into a surrender of their claim to self-government, though their daily life was haunted by fear and their nights were terror-stricken. Sir Hamar Greenwood, faced with his failure, sought refuge in the pretense that the destruction of property was not considerable. In the words of an Irish leader, “over three thousand ruined buildings in Ireland gave him the lie.”

### XII

I have set down what I believe to be the true facts about Ireland, impartially, without special pleading for one side or the other. For that is how history will be written and we shall not be able to dodge its verdict. To my mind now looking at the whole tragedy as it is close to us, I think the verdict will be against England, or at least against British statesmen who betrayed the honor and good name of England, and the ideals for which so many of our men died in the European war. By their lack of generosity in early days when it would have been so easy to be generous, and so fruitful of friendship, by their utter disregard of the Irish temperament and traditions, by their malign favoritism toward the truculence of Ulster—the first to take up arms and proclaim rebellion—by their political intrigues and breaking of pledges, by their adoption of Prussian methods after a war for liberty, by their abandonment of government in Ireland to military and police officials with narrow brains and soulless instincts, by conniving at the indiscipline and private vengeance of armed police, among whom were men of evil character tempted by opportunity, and provoked into passion, by ridiculing all efforts at peace and reconciliation by thousands of liberal minds in England, and falling back upon old

## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

traditions of tyranny and coercion, by hiding the happenings in Ireland from public knowledge in England, and by proceeding stubbornly upon a line of policy which was bound to fail according to all historical experience, and was essentially evil in its principles, they raised up enemies against us in all parts of the world, and so blackened our reputation that it will need the saving grace of time to wash it clean again in years of nobler leadership.

Yet, having written these words, which are not pleasant to write, it is impossible to acquit the Irish people of evil acts and obstinate stupidities which would make one despair of them if they were not redeemed by fine qualities of spirit and character. That guerrilla warfare of theirs was a dirty business, not justified by any claim to liberty. It was a hark back to the cave men, not a lead forward to a new era of civilization and human progress. There are limits even to the claims of liberty, for otherwise all governments would go down in a welter of bloody anarchy, because a majority or minority accused them of "tyranny." The Irish people had a right to demand self-government within the Empire, by all methods consistent with a decent code of honor. Personally I cannot think that the Easter rebellion belonged to that code. Because, whatever the measure of our misdeeds in the past and our tactlessness or stupidity in the beginning of the war, Ireland was not suffering under any grinding tyranny which justified such action. Her people were prosperous. They were free in all but separate government. At that time they were not arrested or imprisoned or coerced for political reasons. They had freedom in their faith. The English people had not been hostile to them. There were ties of friendship and of love between many English and many Irish. Their writers, players, painters, had been accepted with enthusiastic

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

homage in England. Their claim for Home Rule was supported by all liberal Englishmen. In spite of all that happened afterward, their cold-blooded killing of policemen and soldiers went outside the bounds of legitimate warfare, even if we grant their right to resist coercive measures by force of arms.

Their way of argument, as well as their way of warfare, was cunningly unfair. They adopted, to the world, the pose of an innocent people suffering Christian martyrdom under a bloody and ruthless terror, not acknowledging that at least in bloodshed they took the lead, and that men who are attacked have the right to retaliate according to all human law. They seemed to believe, at least for propaganda purposes, that British troops should allow themselves to be ambushed with impunity, that officers or men should allow themselves to be murdered in the presence of their wives, without a gesture of self-defense, that very grim and terrible deeds might be done in the name of Irish liberty, and become ennobled. In the name of Russian liberty the Bolsheviks massacred the Tsar and his daughters with dreadful cruelty, killed thousands of political prisoners, committed acts of great atrocity which are not made white as snow because there was tyranny under Tsardom or cruelty under counter-revolutionary generals of the old regime.

Nor did Sinn Fein reveal any knowledge of English psychology, by imagining that our people would be frightened or fought into surrender. Every ambush they made on British troops was a setback in their claim to self-government, for it choked sympathy and hardened hearts. Every "gunman" they sent to England to burn signal boxes or shipyards was an enemy of people striving for peace with Ireland. The English people were shamed and sickened and startled, not by the ambushes of the I. R. A., but by the policy of

## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

reprisals. Their desire for a peaceful settlement was due not to fear, but to that generosity of soul which the Irish denied. When Terence MacSwiney, Lord Mayor of Cork, died in Brixton prison by hunger striking, there were sarcastic comments, it is true, in the House of Commons, but in the streets of London, when his body passed with a guard of honor in Sinn Fein uniform, the people doffed their hats and were pitiful. And in June of 1921, before the King's visit to Belfast, when the Irish ambushes were in full swing and English soldiers were being killed, there were Sinn Fein processions in London, with the Irish carrying the Republican flags, playing their pipes, singing old rebel songs, and shouting, "Up, Sinn Fein!" The London crowds watched them without hostility, without a scuffle, even with smiling sympathy, for there is something in us which might seem like weakness but for our record in the Great War, and it is not weakness, but a generous spirit toward liberty and those who struggle for it, even though our own government is for a while opposed to it in spirit and in act. I doubt whether any other people in the world would have been so magnanimous, so "sporting." I doubt whether the Irish themselves will learn a lesson from it, for in spite of many beautiful qualities of Irish character, they are, as a Celtic people, unforgiving, ungenerous to those they call their enemy, likely to receive a gift as an insult, to answer fair play by ill will, and good humor with ill temper, nourishing grievances for their own sake.

So it was, to cite a trivial instance, when I went to the United States. I was scrupulously fair to the Irish, and though I denounced the acts of Sinn Fein, as I have denounced them here, I also denounced the acts of "reprisals" in stronger terms still. I gave the facts of Irish history as I have given them here, fairly, without bias, except, perhaps, leaning a little to the

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

Irish side—because I am English—with strict regard to historical truth, as far as I know it. But the Irish-Americans shouted me down in New York, Chicago, and other cities, and they shouted louder when I spoke fair things about the Irish than when I admitted the injustice of England in the past. They did not want fair play. They wanted passionate unreason, excuse for violence, more food for hatred; and it seemed to me that their love of Ireland was less than their hatred of England.

All that is in the bad old past. As I write there is new hope for Ireland, as for England and the world.

On the eve of the King's visit to Belfast to open the Ulster Parliament on June 22d there had been Cabinet dissensions which still belong to secret political history. Unionists and Coalition Liberals were violently divided as to the future policy in Ireland, some demanding a new offer of conciliation, some urging a stronger measure of military coercion in the South and West. The Prime Minister was, it seems, for coercion, and that night in the House of Lords, Lord Birkenhead, who, at the Cabinet, was for conciliation, made a truculent speech which seemed to close all doors of hope. In reply to some Irish Unionist peers who pressed for the enlargement of the financial powers given to the two Parliaments of Ireland under the new Act, he said that such expedients were useless, that there was war in Ireland, and that the Irish must be crushed by the dispatch of large bodies of fresh troops.

At the same time the Sinn Fein leaders intercepted a letter dated June 16th, from Sir Henry Wilson, chief of the Imperial General Staff, to Sir James Craig, Premier of the Northern Parliament, regretting that he could not attend the opening of that Parliament, as he was engaged in dispatching large reinforcements to Ireland for the purpose of finally crushing the Sinn Fein rebellion.

## THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND

In such black thunderclouds of political strife the King and Queen set out for Belfast, risking their lives gladly for the sake of peace in Ireland, though their Ministers were afraid to risk their jobs. Belfast gave them a great welcome, and the heart of Ireland itself was touched by this courageous act and by the King's speech, in which he declared his love for the Irish people and prayed that they might work together in the cause of peace. The text for his speech was "Let us forget and forgive."

The effect of this call from the King was instantaneous throughout the world, and in every country there was an appeal for a new policy of conciliation, and a stern criticism of the contrast between the King's magnanimity and the harshness of that speech by the Lord Chancellor, "the keeper of his conscience."

On that night, June 22d, De Valera, "President of the Irish Republic," was arrested in a house at Blackrock, Dublin, but released next day, when his identity was discovered; and on June 26th a letter was dispatched to him by the Prime Minister of England:

June 24th, 1921.

Sir:

The British Government are deeply anxious that so far as they can assure it, the King's appeal for reconciliation in Ireland shall not have been made in vain. Rather than allow yet another opportunity of settlement in Ireland to be cast aside, they feel it incumbent upon them to make a final appeal in the spirit of the King's words for a conference between themselves and the representatives of Southern and Northern Ireland.

I write, therefore, to convey the following invitation to you as the chosen leader of the great majority in Southern Ireland, and to Sir James Craig, the Premier of Northern Ireland.

(1) That you should attend a conference here in London, in company with Sir James Craig, to explore to the utmost the possibility of a settlement.

(2) That you should bring with you for the purpose any colleagues whom you may select. The Government will of course



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

give a safe conduct to all who may be chosen to participate in the conference.

We make this invitation with a fervent desire to end the ruinous conflict which has for centuries divided Ireland and embittered the relations of the peoples of these two islands, who ought to live in neighbourly harmony with each other, and whose co-operation would mean so much not only to the Empire but to humanity.

We wish that no endeavour should be lacking on our part to realize the King's prayer, and we ask you to meet us, as we will meet you, in the spirit of conciliation for which His Majesty appealed.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

(Signed) D. LLOYD GEORGE.

This invitation to a conference was accepted by Sir James Craig, to whom it was sent in the same terms, and De Valera replied guardedly that, while earnestly desiring to help in bringing about a lasting peace between the people of these two islands, he saw no means by which it could be reached if the Prime Minister denied Ireland's essential unity and set aside the principle of national self-determination. Before replying more fully he desired to consult with representatives of the "political minority" in Ireland.

Those consultations with the Irish Unionists followed by conferences with the British government are now taking place, and it is the prayer of the English and Irish peoples that out of the darkness of long and tragic strife there may come the light of a lasting peace between two peoples whose union in liberty and in affection will be a promise of hope for the youth that is coming to make the new world.

The tragedy of Ireland through a thousand years of history may be replaced by the happiness of her future, free among the federation of British peoples, and in the society of all the nations.



## IX

### THE UNITED STATES AND WORLD PEACE

#### I

At the beginning of 1921 I had an opportunity of studying at first hand, and with extraordinary opportunities of knowledge, one of the most important questions of the world, upon which the future of civilization, and especially of our European life, largely depends. It was a question of what the United States of America would do under the new leadership which had come to us with President Harding, and what part her people would play in international policy. That question is not yet answered in full, because the future holds its own secrets, but as far as we know it the reply is hopeful.

For whether we like it or not—and there are some who do not—America has largely in her hands the great decision as to whether white civilization, as we know it, and as most of us like it, will progress in an orderly way to a higher plane of development in peaceful industry, with a little more comfort for plain folk, with a good margin for the little things of art and beauty which make up the joy of life, greater security against the menace of war, and a relief from the deadening weight of armaments, or whether it will fall, as some European nations have already fallen, into decay and disease, werty-stricken, underfed, staggering and fainting through a jungle darkness.

If America withdrew into herself, holding herself aloof

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

from the world problems, demanding full payment of her loans, refusing extension of credit, and hardening into antagonism against the Allies in the war, it would be impossible, I am sure, to heal the wounds of Europe. We cannot do without American grains, fats, raw material, and manufactured goods. Who thinks so is a fool, without any knowledge of world conditions. More than that, Europe needs the moral support and judgment and friendliness of the United States. The League of Nations is at present, in spite of the good efforts of many good men, utterly impotent to deal with the vital problems of world peace and health or to enforce its decisions upon conflicting nationalities, interests, and rivalries, so long as the most powerful nation in the world to-day stays outside the family council. That is as clear as sunlight to a thinking mind. On the other hand, the entry of the United States into a league of peoples, or at least a world council called to consider the way of recovery and a rebuilding of international relations, will make real what is now unreal and give immense strength to any common agreement. America can support her will by strong argument, because we are all so deeply in her debt, and in the future will need desperately her surplus of food supplies on easy terms.

Do not let us forget that the United States of America, being made up of human beings, might be more than aloof and disinterested in the welfare of Europe, which is bad enough, because it checks the chance of quick recovery. Her people might become unfriendly, hostile—swept by passion if we played the fool with them, beyond patience, by a series of blunders, the stupidities of statesmen, the tit-for-tat game in the Press. She can take a clear choice between the part of destroyer and the part of builder. In a little while she could raise the greatest army in the world, in a little while she will have the biggest navy. She could destroy the

## THE UNITED STATES AND WORLD PEACE

last chance of civilized progress in Europe, and, having done that, would be herself destroyed. But that choice is hers, if she likes to take it, and the power is hers.

She can choose, as I believe she will, the part of builder. It is her national quality. Her people are builders and not destroyers. They have already built a great New World, splendid and strong, in spite of evil elements. Under her new leadership she could help to build another New World, better than her own, ours as well as hers, that New World to which we all look forward with the coming of youth. Will she do that? In what way will she help in reconstruction and the new building on the ruins that were made?

I found some clue to the answer after a visit of eight weeks in the United States, when every day was filled with the experience of meeting large numbers of men and women eager to get some trustworthy evidence about the actual conditions of Europe, anxious for some guiding principles upon which their country may fix its faith in dealing with those present problems, and keen to "put me wise" about the stresses and strains of American life in this crisis of the world's history.

During those two crowded months I visited about thirty cities, going no farther west than Chicago and Milwaukee. Most of them are cities about equal in size to our northern industrial towns, like Bolton and Wigan, but with more comfort for the individual citizen, more opportunities for social recreation, more luxury for the rich and less squalor for the poor, than in the same type of town in England. Here, in these places, I found the real America, more than in New York, which is so vast, so complicated with alien populations, and so cosmopolitan in its interests, that it has no single and definite character. But in places like Worcester, Troy,

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

Scranton, Utica, Wilkes-Barre, and Detroit one finds the typical qualities of American character and life. I met the people of good standing—men who had built up their fortunes in the industry of these cities and have a local pride and patriotism, the leading manufacturers and business men, lawyers, doctors, and school-teachers, newspaper proprietors and editors, and the women, their wives and daughters—who organize, ceaselessly and strenuously, the innumerable charities of the town, women's clubs (far more important than our own in size and activity), literary and musical societies, Red Cross and relief works, and all kinds of "leagues" and labors of social service.

These people are "provincial" in the sense that their experience of life is mostly limited to their own cities, though many of them go fairly often to New York, spend their summer holidays on the coast of Maine, or California, and look back to a European trip or two with abiding memories. The women, especially, are great readers of contemporary literature, and do not limit themselves to works of fiction, but concentrate more on biographies, memoirs, and books of an ethical kind which contain some "spiritual uplift." Everywhere they were reading Mrs. Asquith's autobiography, startled, more than a little scandalized, but highly amused by its indiscretions. H. G. Wells's *Outline of History* was a first favorite at the moment, and they found it an easy guide to the enormous adventure of the ages. *Main Street*, by Sinclair Lewis, was the "best seller" among their own novels, and with photographic realism pictures the narrow interests, the local scandals, the small world, of the ordinary American citizen in the Middle West towns, utterly out of touch with any other style of civilization, knowing nothing and caring nothing about problems of the human family remote from his own petty and selfish interests.

## THE UNITED STATES AND WORLD PEACE

I did not meet the *Main Street* type. The people I met—and I met hundreds of them in those brief eight weeks—were of better intellectual standing and wider human sympathy, and I look back upon a long portrait gallery of keen, energetic, thoughtful men, and of kind, frank, generous-mannered women, who were thinking hard and talking hard about what America would do now that Harding had succeeded Wilson, and now that the nation had to make up its mind about its future policy in the world. There are millions of such people in the United States, and, though I only met hundreds of them, I believe that I was able to get from them the general convictions and tendency of thought of their class and kind.

Those I met were nearly all Republicans. They had voted against Wilson and the Wilsonian policy, partly, I imagine, because they believed that Wilson had flouted the Constitution and the instincts of his people by playing "a lone hand" in Europe, without getting the advice or consent of the Senate and Congress, partly because they resented the length of time he had kept them out of the war, but largely because they believed he had failed in his handling of the European situation, to the hurt of American prestige and interests. The immense defeat of the Democrats, and of Mr. Wilson, was not entirely a proof of desire to wash their hands of international obligations. A deep sense of resentment against Mr. Wilson himself was reinforced by irritations with American administration during the war, which had hurt individual susceptibilities. As a friend of mine put it briefly, the question asked in the presidential election was, "Are you sick and tired of the present administration?" and the answer was, "By God! we are!" The Irish-Americans flung their weight against Wilson because of non-interference in the matter

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

of Ireland; the German-Americans, because of his share in the peace treaty.

### II

For some time after the war enthusiasm had died out there was the same lethargy and exhaustion of emotion in the United States as had overtaken other countries. No new impulse had replaced that emotion, no new national ideal. The spirit of the American people had drawn back into itself. They were disgusted with European rivalries and greeds. They said, in effect: "Let us leave those Europeans to stew in their own juice. We can't do anything with them, anyhow. Let us get an administration which will pull us out of that mess, collect the debts owing to us, keep us free from entanglements and obligations with alien peoples, and concentrate upon an exclusively American policy according to our old historic traditions." Not an unreasonable policy, if it were possible.

When I arrived in the United States two things were happening which were already beginning to modify, among the educated classes, this philosophy of national isolation and independence. One was the financial situation leading to heavy losses in almost every branch of commerce, and a rising tide of unemployment. The other was the coming into office of President Harding and his colleagues and the anxious questioning of all serious citizens as to whether, after all, the new President, and the men whom he was selecting as his counselors, would be equal to the increasing difficulties of the governing task. Even during my short stay I was able to observe a change of view. . . .

Financially the United States was going through a bad time—worse than most of us in England realized. Over and over again in the smoking cars of long-distance

## THE UNITED STATES AND WORLD PEACE

trains I overheard business men deploring the heavy losses they had suffered. Prices were toppling down everywhere. Buyers of any kind of stocks—copper, leather, grain, motor cars, railroads—had been badly hit, in many cases ruined. Exporters were choked up with undelivered goods which they had bought at a high price and could not sell at cutthroat rates. Manufacturers had overproduced, and the cost of production was so great, owing to the price of labor, that they could not hope to compete in foreign markets. There were five and a half million unemployed men in the United States. Real distress was creeping up in cities like Detroit, from where there was an exodus of factory hands back to the land. The situation improved a little, but not much.

Now the American mind was searching around for the reasons behind this sudden "slump," and was inclined to attribute it to local conditions, the aggressive wage demands of labor, and temporary causes. At first the American "plain man" resented the suggestion that the simple cause of this stagnation in trade was, and is, the collapse of the world markets, the social rot that has overtaken Russia, Poland, Austria, the heavy burden of taxation that destroys the purchasing power of France, Italy, Germany, and England. At first I found people challenge me when in my lectures I pointed out the economic impossibility of the United States existing with anything like the measure of her present prosperity without entering into a close trade relationship with the European nations. They were silent for a little while when I stated that America was almost as dependent upon Europe, as Europe upon America. They were inclined to shrink back from the logical result of my argument, when I urged them, for their own sakes, as well as for white civilization itself, to come into an association of nations—never mind



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

whether it is called the League of Nations—to extend long credits to the poorer countries, to lead the way to gradual disarmament, and to aid the recovery of the world by a free exchange of raw material and manufactured goods. But I perceived before the end of my stay a general recognition of these facts, not due to my poor speeches, but to pressure of events.

The American mind, at least among the thinking, reading classes, was already abandoning the idea of "isolation." The well-to-do business man in places like Worcester and Troy had already reached the position of the high financier in New York, that America must come into the settlement of the world crisis, and must ease the burden of the stricken peoples even to the extent, if need be, of holding over the payment of their debts. The women had come to that conclusion before the men.

Then, after the sound and fury of the presidential election and all the bitter, personal vendetta against Mr. Wilson, there was a sense of anxiety about President Harding and his administration. People were asking themselves whether Mr. Harding would rise to anything like the leadership they desired, whether he was able to call to the heart and soul of the people, giving them some enthusiasm and ideal higher than "big business." It may seem sentimental and untrue, but I am certain that I am right when I say that great numbers of American people, after temporary reaction, are craving for some impulse higher than mere material satisfaction. They wish that to be secured first—and they see no security in the present state of affairs—but beyond and above that, they yearn for a touch of nobility in national policy—for some high leadership which would guide them in a spiritual way. They did not expect that from Mr. Harding, though they found him honest and a man of good will, but rather "Main

## THE UNITED STATES AND WORLD PEACE

Street" in his mind. They comforted themselves with the hope that there would be good teamwork, and some of them clung to the name of Hoover as the shining star to which they yoked their faith. But here again they hesitated. Would Hoover—the man who organized the food supplies of starving Europe, the food dictator of the world (for that he was)—play up to the party machine, compromise with men like Daugherty, the new Attorney-General, and be tactful with the wirepullers of the machine which breaks any man who tries to put a spoke in its wheels or give them a different kind of spin? They were afraid that Hoover might get out, or be put out, before he had gone very far.

Secretary Hughes was the greatest hope of the Republican party in the field of foreign affairs, though some of them thought he had too much of the "lawyer mind." I have met Mr. Hughes several times, and have had long talks with him—not for publication. He has a penetrating mind, clear, cool judgment, complete intellectual honesty, and I found in him (what others are surprised to find) a humane outlook upon life, a sensitive sympathy with the sufferings of stricken people. Yet people doubted whether he would obtain the allegiance of the Senate in altruistic ideals.

So many told me, as to a friend, candidly, and I saw in this anxiety the wistfulness of people who have been disappointed with the official actions of their country, felt just a little conscience-stricken because of a failure to come up to their own ideals, and desired earnestly to fulfill their duty to the world, whatever that might be. They wanted to get on to the plane of idealism again, if only it could be squared with reality and common sense. They would even raise an extenuating word for Wilson—though they hated him, so many of them. "He did put up certain broad ideals to which we must feel our way forward. Perhaps his

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

ideals will be remembered when his personal faults have been forgotten." Now and then in big audiences I heard a section fire of applause, or isolated handclaps, when I mentioned Wilson's name. They pitied him, anyhow, for the immensity of his personal tragedy.

The League of Nations still had its adherents, and was gaining more every day. I tested that in the same way, and it never failed to get a quick response, especially from the women. But they would prefer to come in to an assembly of nations called by some other name. It is a matter of pride with the Senate especially, which killed the League in order to kill Wilson. They cannot accept the name of Wilson's instrument. But they must "come in." They felt that in every place where I touched the pulse of public opinion. As one great American leader put it to me—his influence extends to a million people—"it isn't a question of 'coming in.' It's much rather a question of 'getting out.' We are in already. We were in when we sent over our first transports of troops. We are in up to the neck, because we have debts to the value of five billion dollars. We are in because our trade depends upon the markets of the world. The question is, how are we to get out of this world crisis with any business and security and honor." But that amounts to the same thing. The very laws of economics will force America to come into a council of nations, and by the power of her natural resources, her immense reserves of industry, her means of granting credits, it is certain that she will take the lead in the reconstruction of Europe, which means as much to her as to ourselves.

### III

In nearly every section of American society which I touched—I was unable to come in contact with the

## THE UNITED STATES AND WORLD PEACE

factory hands and working classes, which was a great omission—I found a genuine friendship, often an emotional sentiment, for England and Great Britain. This was voiced by the President, with whom I had a personal interview, lasting only for a minute or two, in the White House, a few days after his inauguration. A number of visitors were wanting to see him, trooping in through the open gates (shut during Wilson's term of office) and sitting about the antechambers. They were Senators and Congressmen from the West and Middle West, an old general of Civil War days, a handsome young colonel of the air-craft corps, several ladies of social standing, a little girl sitting with folded hands, looking wide-eyed through big spectacles with tortoiseshell rims, a group of newspaper men smoking cigarettes incessantly. The President's secretary chatted with the visitors as he sat at a desk on which was a great bouquet of roses. This social atmosphere of the White House was simple, informal—a striking contrast, I was told, to the austerity of Mr. Wilson's time. The new President was giving "the glad hand" to everybody, keeping open house, breaking the autocratic spell of his predecessor.

One of his secretaries beckoned me, and I went in and found Mr. Harding receiving his visitors—a tall, heavily built man with a powerful face, deeply lined, puffed under his eyes, square of jaw, with a good-humored mouth and kind eyes, and silver hair. He gripped my hand and asked a few questions, and was a little startled, I fancy, when I asked him suddenly for a message to the English people. He laughed, and could not think of one on the spur of the moment, alluding to newspaper controversy, and bitter things said on both sides, in disjointed sentences. Then he spoke earnestly, with real emotion, I thought, while he still held my hand in a strong grasp.

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

"Friendship between the United States and Great Britain," he said, "is essential for the welfare of the world. Americans of the old stock look upon England as the mother country, and we regard that always as a cherished inheritance, not to be forgotten."

What the President said was told me in other words by hundreds of other people—I could say thousands, without exaggeration—and with absolute sincerity. Senator Knox was one of those who spoke to me about the misunderstanding of the American attitude to England, the mistaken idea that there was an underlying hostility likely to lead one day to war.

"The mere idea of it is impossible and ridiculous," he said, and he mentioned the wave of indignation and incredulity which had passed through America like an electric shock when such words as "drifting toward war" were used (or reported as having been used, which is quite a different thing) by one of our representatives. He admitted that there were historical prejudices, fostered in the school book, which created a bad impression in the minds of American children, hard to eradicate. But that impression of England's bad action in the past was counterbalanced by other influences of literature and tradition, and in any case the universities were helping to form a fairer point of view about the War of Independence and other periods. He once astonished a fellow Senator during a visit to Windsor Castle by laying a bunch of flowers reverently before a statue of George III.

"What on earth are you doing that for?" asked his friend.

"I am paying a tribute to the Father of the American Republic," said Senator Knox. "If that fellow hadn't been such an old blockhead we might still have been under British rule."

The only trace of hostility I found was among the

## THE UNITED STATES AND WORLD PEACE

extreme section of the Irish-Americans, and certainly that was fierce, unreasoning, and dangerous. At my first lecture in the Carnegie Hall, New York, I had only been going five minutes or so before the first interruption began, in a rich Irish brogue, from a top gallery. I heard the words, "Why don't you take the marbles out of your mouth?" And thinking this was merely a friendly criticism of my hopelessly "English" accent, I squared my chest and spoke louder. But that was only the beginning of trouble, deliberate and hostile, to whatever I said, and I was speaking about Austria, and not Ireland. Amidst a hubbub of sound and fury I heard the words, "English poltroon," "Cutthroat English," and, "What about Egypt?" I tried to tell a story about a young Austrian doctor. Several times I began a description of his suffering. Then I had to abandon him to his fate. Standing alone on a big platform, I heard waves of tumultuous noise, and could see in the galleries a series of running fights, separate skirmishes, the pounce of small groups on isolated individuals. I felt curiously far off and aloof, intensely interested in that drama which seemed to have nothing to do with me. Down in the stalls a fat man wedged in his chair was bellowing incoherently until silenced by his neighbors. A voice below the platform called up to me, "We have sent for the police." Presently I went on talking, with spasmodic interruptions from the galleries. I was able to get through my address, and I found that any simple words of mine about England and Anglo-American friendship aroused wonderful applause. The great audience desired to express to me their utter disgust with the Irish demonstration, their friendly feeling to an Englishman on the platform, to England for whom he spoke with fairness to Ireland. The hostile element was in a minority of fifty to three thousand or more

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

After that I had other experiences, as at Chicago, on the eve of St. Patrick's Day, when it was forty-five minutes before I could finish my first sentence. Immediately I stepped on the platform, the din began, deafening and menacing. Fifty young Irishmen shouted orations at me from the galleries. Two hundred or more hooted and yelled. In the top gallery a gang of girls catcalled in shrill unison. The men were angry and violent. They desired, it seemed, to tear me limb from limb, and fought desperately with the police when at last they were ejected. For the first time in my life I was compelled to accept a bodyguard of detectives. They explained politely that it was not so much for my sake as for theirs that they wished to sit by my side in a taxicab, to walk with me on the way to the hotel. "It's our reputation we want to safeguard," they said. "If anything happens to you we should get the kick."

Even on my last night in New York, when I received the greatest honor of my life at a banquet to me by a thousand people under the auspices of the Allied Loyalty League, there came to my table all through the dinner hostile messages from the world outside. I opened one letter and it said, "You are a dirty English rat." I opened another, and it said, "You are the hell-hound of a dirty race." Outside the Biltmore Hotel small boys, paid a few cents for their job, distributed leaflets accusing me of horrible lies.

"This man has insulted every loyal American," said one of the leaflets. "All who associate with him, dine with him, or honor him in any way are disloyal Americans. This man should be deported at once."

The violence of the Irish-American sentiment, the amazing lack of reason in their methods, may be judged by this series of attacks upon me, for in Ireland I was known as a good friend, and in England I had not hesi-

## UNITED STATES AND WORLD PEACE

to criticize and condemn the British government that I considered the stupidity and brutality of their actions in Ireland. So in America I spoke plainly and fairly, setting out the plain truth, allowing what could be allowed to the Irish point of view, arguing for reconciliation and peace which should give Ireland under Dominion Home Rule, if they were willing to abandon their guerrilla warfare. But nothing that I said made the slightest difference. They looked at me as an Englishman, and in their pamphlets and leaflets made no secret of their desire to force a war between America and Great Britain.

It had that amount of importance that it was linked with other sinister movements—Bolshevik and Pan-American—and with the persistent, venomous anti-Irish propaganda of Hearst's newspapers, with their large popular circulation among the masses of ignorant people. It was important enough in its influence upon unthinking crowds, unable to discriminate between falsity and truth, and quickly moved to passion, as a warning to the British government to settle the question rapidly, sensibly, without temper or emotion, with a return to sanity and statesmanship. For as long as it remained unsettled there would be this poisonous poison, spreading ill will in the minds of a part of the American people. Apart from that its influence upon the American mind as a whole. On the contrary, the unjust, ridiculous, and ill-mannered demands of the Sinn Fein minority among the Irish-Americans disgusted all decent citizens and produced a reaction in favor of England. An Irish-Germanic demonstration, Deutschland-go-Bragh, as it was called by a wit, in Madison Square Garden, where several speeches were made, was followed by the counter-demonstration at which General Pershing and other speakers proclaimed the loyalty of America to



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

those with whom they had fought in the war, amidst scenes of enormous enthusiasm.

In a personal but wonderful way I gained by the same reaction against violence and lack of fair play. The Sinn Fein disturbers of my meetings were never more than 5 per cent. The other 95, angered by what happened, gave me tremendous ovations for England's sake, so that I was uplifted on waves of enthusiastic applause.

### IV

America has many difficult problems to face, some fears haunt the minds of the people, inherited, traditional habits of mind drag her back from a free vision of new necessities, and her political leaders are not, on the whole, representative of the best instincts of her wisest folk. Her difficulties with labor are intensifying, for men who enjoyed high wages and became used to a higher standard of life do not lightly drop back to a lower scale, especially when there is such a wide gulf between their highest wage and the great luxury of the very rich. Among her alien populations not quickly assimilated in the melting pot there are dangerous currents of thought. But the risk is being minimized by the falling prices, and wise concessions by employers of labor in many great industries.

One fear she has, especially on the Pacific coast, is that of Japan, and when I was last in the United States there was uneasy talk about an "inevitable war" among people who, I think, exaggerated the menace. It was that thought which gave aid to the demand for a big navy, at a time when the world was ready for a call to disarmament. In America, as in all countries anxious of great power, there is an imperialist group eager to acquire new territory as a proof of power, and now and then one hears loose talk about "clearing up

## THE UNITED STATES AND WORLD PEACE

Mexico." But that is quite opposed to the instincts of the people as a whole, who hate the thought of such adventures.

The political machine in America, controlled in Washington, is antiquated in its views of life, I fancy, and a heavy drag upon the progress of liberal and generous ideals. At a time when the whole world was in need of free trade, including America herself, it was proposed to put up a tariff against Canadian wheat and other tariffs against foreign goods—a muddle-headed arithmetic which would hurt American commerce and limit its activities. At a time when, as I am certain, the great body of American people who read and think and feel are eager to help in the reconstruction of Europe and the recovery of the world's markets by carrying on the work they began when they sent their boys to France, or went themselves, old Senators from the West, Congressmen from "Main Street," are harking back to the policy of isolation, calling themselves "100 per cent American" and believing that that means the narrow selfishness of the Chinese wall. They will, it is certain, try to pull at the coat-tails of President Harding whenever he wishes to take a step forward into a larger relationship with the human family. They will shout to him, "We put you in to keep us out!" and the ignorant masses, no more ignorant than ours, but more remote from Europe, will give their backing to those old and unwise men.

As an Englishman I ought not, perhaps, to write these things, yet the American people will forgive me, for I have been frank with them on all things, and candid in any criticism of English faults. I believe, too, unlike some of their own pessimists, among whom is the most brilliant brain they have in the field of journalism—my friend Frank Simonds—that liberal ideas will prevail over narrow instincts, and that the

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

generous impulses of the intellectuals will move the sluggish, inert mass of unthinking folk.

Steadily through this year of 1921 the Harding administration gave unmistakable signs of abandoning the policy of "isolation" and of coming in to the councils of the nations with good will and helpfulness, as I had ventured to prophesy after my visit. In spite of the apparent inconsistency of voting great credits for a big navy, due, as I have said, to anxiety about Japan, President Harding intimated very quickly his intention of summoning the Powers of the world to a conference for the discussion of a practical measure of all-round reduction in armaments and the establishment of an international tribunal to arbitrate on all matters of potential dispute. That intention was fulfilled in July of this year, when the President made a definite proposal to the Allied Powers for a conference on disarmament, thereby making a practical appeal to the human race to abandon war as an argument. It is a good memory of mine that I was able to put in some words on behalf of that proposal at the Capitol in Washington, when I had the rare honor of being invited to give evidence before the committee of Congress on naval affairs, on the possibility and scope of such a conference.

Before his great appeal, the President, acting upon the advice of Secretary Hughes, decided that as America had an interest in the question of German reparations, it would be logical to have a representative on the Reparations Committee, and that as the supreme council of the Allies was dealing with the world affairs which intensely affected the interests of the United States, it would be only reasonable to have an American ambassador present at least while the deliberations were in progress. People in England, as well as people in America, watched these moves away from isolation toward international partnership, and drew their breath a little

## THE UNITED STATES AND WORLD PEACE

and said, "Perhaps, after all, there is a chance for the League of Nations!" Strange! for in America the doom of the League has long ago been sealed in yard-long headings across American newspapers:

"The League is dead!"

A friend of mine, named Lowell Mallett, one of the shrewdest observers of American politics, described the psychological effect in Washington of finding suddenly that that cry may have been rather premature.

"Solemnly or exultantly, prayerfully or profanely, earnestly or indifferently, one has heard it proclaimed in America every day since Harding was elected. Those who desired the League's death have announced the consummation of their wish so frequently that they have come to believe it true. Of course they have had to presuppose that because America was not a member there wasn't any League, but they have been quite equal to this presupposition.

"The League is . . . !"

"The familiar phase was broken in two on a day not long ago. It was the day that President Harding and Secretary Hughes announced their decision to participate, to some extent, in the councils of the Allies. The suspended exclamation might have been heard in the cloakrooms of Congress where our statesmen gather to smoke and talk about themselves. It was completed by one such statesman in this manner—

"Alive! My gosh! the blamed thing lives!"

"This Senator accepted the decision to participate in Allied councils as the beginning of the end of the struggle that has been going on under cover within the administration since March 4th. And his view is shared by many other bitter opponents of the League. It is not accepted gracefully, however. It is fairly safe to predict that Washington will witness the bitterest sort of a death battle over the question, but more than one oppo-

...notwithstanding convinced  
States had decreed its d  
for election committed  
both life and death for  
the League have been  
was their victory when t  
but the Republican supp  
saying not a great deal,  
tion meant nothing of th

American financiers an  
so hostile to the League  
councils of Europe. Fo  
investments in European  
had come to cease playi  
affairs. In the twelve r  
three hundred and fifty n  
to foreign borrowers by  
despite widespread econo  
States. As Mallett said,  
lion dollars daily flowing  
fields, American bankers  
ing a policy that will prot  
the League, or the Lea  
isolation.



## THE UNITED STATES AND WORLD PEACE

London. He banged, barred, and bolted the door, it seemed, upon any American participation in any kind of League of Nations. More interesting than his speech, however, were the comments upon it in the American Press. There was a widespread expression of opinion that the ambassador had gone beyond his book and had not spoken the mind of the American people as a whole, nor of the Harding administration, which, as I was informed on good authority, "was busily searching the dictionary for some other word than "League"!"

### v

I am not a fanatic on the subject of the League. I believe that the general good will of people and their spiritual renaissance are more important to the world than any machinery of international justice. Nevertheless, good will itself needs an organization by which it may express its ideals and give orderly effect to its agreements. For that purpose the League of Nations provides an organized system by which all nations may come into conference and consider their national problems in relation to the rest of the world, and gain the free consent and support of other peoples for their national interests and rights and claims, while consenting themselves to equal rights for all other peoples, provided they do not inflict damage upon the family of nations.

It should be a parliament of peoples, whose power is based not upon force, but on agreement, at least, on moral force rather than on physical force. The decrees of its assembly should advise rather than command, and the work of its councilors should be scientific and not political. It will never be a super state, dominating in its power over peoples who try to resist its decrees or who dispute its authority, though the expression of a

and political intrigues  
will not be overcome  
representative of their  
their words are responsible  
when the peoples  
sibility and insecurity  
cause of weakness  
only half a League,  
empty chairs. With  
States, no proposal  
interests of those nations  
In spite of that, it  
cause the spiritual  
low ebb in the years  
ideal of international  
of the war spirit and  
worn rubbish, the League  
work. Alone it has  
before the imagination  
to itself forces of plain  
though some of its  
disheartened. Outside  
is done, there has been  
by experts.



## THE UNITED STATES AND WORLD PEACE

long thereto (like the United States of America), men brains and untired hearts have been studying world problems of health, commerce, wages, hours of work, armaments, transport, communication, and science, not in a political way, limited by national egotism, but in a scientific way, across the frontiers of prejudice and rivalry. They have been learning to think internationally. They have been preparing the groundwork for the new architecture of human progress. They have actual achievements to their credit for the shaping of international relations in the thoughts of statesmen and financiers, if not yet in law.

The financial conference produced a scheme of international credits which is the basis of all present discussion in America and Europe.

The Barcelona conference set out a number of valuable methods of securing freedom of communication and transit.

The international health organization will, without doubt, be a new charter for the prevention of epidemic disease and other scourges of the human race.

Another committee has devised means of co-ordinating preventive measures against the traffic in opium, cocaine, and other dangerous drugs.

Recommendations have been made for breaking down the world-wide conspiracy of the white-slave traffic.

Plans have been prepared for the institution of a permanent court of international justice, and committees have been at work on the possibility of limiting armaments among the great Powers and prohibiting the production of arms and ammunition among savage or uncivilized races.

That work may be thrown on one side by the wickedness of governments or the indifference of peoples, but, whatever insanity may take possession of the world, that work has been for sanity and well done.



## AMERICAN UNION.

Suppose that in two or three years two great Powers threaten to broke out to-morrow. Suppose the League of Nations, and, whilst it is in existence, in spite of the provisions of the Covenant, suddenly mobilized its forces for the moment to break the Covenant and commit an act of war against the aggressor. That in such circumstances the United States would put its weight on the side of the aggressor. This does not mean that the United States would send its troops to Europe. It means that it would do its own affair. But it does mean that America would be ranged, not on the side of law and order, but on the side of the aggressor. Or, if the League were to kill a League of forty-eight nations, it is as certain as anything in this world that the United States proves by its deeds its usefulness, and is not willing to stand aside from the aggressor.

Outside the League of Nations, the United States will not ignore its evil. President Harding himself has said that the United States were and never will be a party to the League again, "We are ready to stand aside from the aggressor."

## THE UNITED STATES AND WORLD PEACE

If that spirit is fulfilled, it is good enough. In friendly alliance with the League of Nations—a League vivified by the interests and allegiance of millions of nobodies—America will exercise her influence in Europe, and share the counsels of the world. In England there is a growing allegiance for the purpose of the League, rather moving and revealing in its manifestations, as when tens of thousands gathered together in the parks of English cities on a summer day this year, and proclaimed their faith anew in its purpose and possibilities. The idea had taken root in little houses of back streets, in simple minds stricken by the misery of war and looking for a new wisdom of men, in the hearts of many mothers of boys. They came out in their masses for no selfish interest of class or trade, but for the new hope of humanity symbolized at least by the League as a supreme court of international justice. For as my friend G. H. Perris said in the last words he wrote before his death in the service of the League—

Internationalism is not a negative thing, a state of continual protestation; it is a positive growth towards a fuller and finer life. This is but a first hesitating step. I look forward to the day—not in my lifetime—when all Nations of the world will be in permanent combination not only for arbitration instead of war, for the regulation of their traffic and their laws, for the abolition of disease and of slave-trade, but in the effort to grapple with that terrible enemy—the periodic trade crisis—and to join in turning the forces of nature to the highest account for the universal benefit. The immediate task and the distant vision, both are essential to a full life.

That, after all, is the idea of the League, and though the United States may never enter the League itself, many millions of her people, as I know, not by second-hand report, but by what I have seen and heard, have already given their allegiance to the idea, and in every city of the United States there is, I am certain, a group of men and women whose forward-looking imagination sees

"Americanism" by individual men and United States, have sense of human natu- barisms, break down life cleaner, more effi- happiness. People w- ing members of a Le- the American people - a national faith and a us all the way, and s- rescue of starving peo- a lead not to be kept ishness, or misled by with other nations of t- Quietly, behind the s- recorded, American bu- year been working for and their financial kno- small influence upon th- the advantage of mee- bankers and business me- England, and always I h- ings with th-

## THE UNITED STATES AND WORLD PEACE

wonderfully idealistic in their outlook. I mean that they want to help, and not merely to profit. They want to restore the health of Europe as well as to safeguard their own trade, both objects going hand in hand.

That was the spirit with which the delegates on the International Chamber of Conferences made their proposals in London, and especially of the group of experts in association with Mr. Filene. They based their philosophy of international finance for the restoration of Europe on the resolutions of the Brussels conference, which, in their conviction, gave to the world the first statement of the necessary steps which must be taken by each country, in order to start Europe on the road to a sound financial and economic condition. The most important advice they gave to Europe was the necessity of a strict policy regarding taxation and economy, the avoidance of additional borrowing, and the deflation of currency. Mr. Filene and his friends made plain their belief that ruin and revolution are unavoidable unless the nations of Europe disarm and economize, and they wished this belief to be publicly and widely expressed, so that governments might be strengthened in action which would be, inevitably, unpopular and unpleasant, when they tried to square the illusions of public hope with the stern realities of economic laws. So far many governments have been overthrown by their people whenever they tried to enforce such a policy or to hint plainly at disagreeable truth. It is only by a campaign of truth-telling that economy may be accepted by people still thirsting for the "fruits of victory" promised them by politicians in return for votes.

On the other hand, many business men of the United States have not been grudging in their promise to grant credits to impoverished nations, in order to recover their own prosperity of trade and revive the activities of European laborers. I am not good enough as an

... interests of a li  
They were looking  
scientists, without pr  
and effect.

All details of finan  
tance after all, comp  
purpose of the Unite  
not blind to certain  
and of danger, in the  
(as in that of all peop  
frailties of nature), the  
of all their splendid qu  
ship for them which  
Their strength, their  
of youth give them a  
ward those who differ  
In the mass they have n  
sentiment, and do not  
and doubts, or balance  
scales of judgment. Th  
sharp and clear lines, a  
utterly. As a people t  
not like, the easy tolera  
enabled our crowds to

## THE UNITED STATES AND WORLD PEACE

resistance to British coercion (while supporting coercion), who clinked beer mugs with German soldiers a few days after armistice, who allow anarchists to talk their folly in the parks, and who criticize their own government, as I have done, with profound love for their country, whose faults they also admit and exaggerate. The American mind has a religious reverence for "the state," which sometimes lends itself to intellectual tyranny and to a hard intolerance of minorities, cranks, conscientious objectors, passive resisters, radicals, and "reformers."

Majority opinion in the United States is all-powerful, and too powerful, and the clear-cut mind of the American citizen, with his straight verdict on all questions of life, is likely to lead to trouble, perhaps even to conflict, within the state or without, when it comes sharp up against a challenge of forces which may only be avoided by delicate compromise, by understanding of opposing views, and by a little yielding to other folks' ideas. As a nation the American people are self-conscious and oversensitive to criticism, at least in comparison with the English people, who have a weakness for self-criticism and depreciation. I write these things frankly, with the privilege of friendship which must be sincere without being fulsome. But I have written at length my impressions of American life and character in another book, and need not repeat them here, but will only say that I believe with all my heart and soul that the spirit of the people in the mass, and among those I know with individual friendship, is inspired by a splendid common sense, by a fine simplicity of outlook, and by an instinctive desire to act in honor and in justice to all the world. Despite some elements of hostility due to foreign influence, among groups of people still stirred by the rivalries of race in Europe, the heart of the American people, as a whole, and the sentiment of most of its

of emotion beyond a  
wonderfully kind.

haps must have the  
both countries, whi  
evil, and other force  
passion, in both cou  
and try to fan up h  
picious, but unless  
by some madness or  
there is a body of c  
and chivalrous, whi  
to the hopes of hum


I remember on my  
miles west of New Yo  
of leading men of th  
old gentleman whon  
courteous and gay  
little jests to keep tl  
face became grave, a  
said with profound e  
toast: To the death  
States and Great Bri  
and drank in silence.



## THE UNITED STATES AND WORLD PEACE

throughout the United States there is this hope for unbroken friendship between our two peoples, and on our side we have in our bones so strong a sense of our common heritage of history and tradition that we are apt to presume on it too much and be a little too free in comment and in criticism, as though actually we were members of the same family who may dispense with formal courtesies.

We are not the same people. Our psychology has many differences. Our angle of vision is from opposite sides of the world. Little accidental ways of manner and speech and custom may irritate one another now and then. But in all large things, in all the things that matter, we may, I think, count upon each other and work together. That is one of the best guaranties of hope for the future of the whole family, unless it is spoiled by some unknown folly waiting in the years to come for its time of madness and of ruin.





**A**MONG certain c  
minate and devel  
over the world durin  
one another by barb  
poison gas, as well as  
was one which I imag  
effect upon the world  
seemed doubtful, it e  
men. It was the idea  
responsible for the m  
they called it, and g  
political philosophy in  
inevitable. Youth hat

In the war the boys  
raids when the chance  
useful purpose served,  
divisions, corps, and a  
lines and engaged in co  
raids they could report  
of casualties they coul  
and "the fighting spi  
white-haired old buffe



## THE CHANCE OF YOUTH

never failed to incur enormous casualties on our side for no perceptible advantage of position or ascendancy. Young officers and young private soldiers cursed the old men for their orders and counter-orders, for their "spit-and-polish" discipline, for their "eye wash," and their sham heroics. This attitude of mind was not limited to British soldiers. As far as I can find out, it was prevalent in all armies.

But the detestation of youth for the old men went much farther back than the headquarters staffs. It went back intensively to the elderly civilians at home who kept reiterating, year after year, with splendid patriotism, "We will fight to the last man." Or in French, "*Jusqu'au bout!*" I have heard language not to be repeated about those old gentlemen in Parliament, in government offices, in the City, and in the great industries devoted, for the time being, to war contracts. The suggestion in one mess that those elderly patriots should be used as sand bags to prop up the front-line parapets was received with uproarious applause. The conviction that in the next war—if ever human insanity "asked" for another—the rule should be made, "Old men first," was unanimously approved. Young poets of the trenches wrote mordant sonnets to their old murderers, to those fat and prosperous men who made fortunes out of the carnival of death, to the hard-faced men who ordered youth into the shambles, to the old ruffians who gained honors and rewards until they had flower-borders on their breasts, in "cushy" jobs beyond sound of the guns.

This condemnation of the old men was unkind, and in great numbers of cases unjust. Fathers bled at the heart for their sons, were killed themselves by a slow and agonizing death when the boy they loved best in the world went down. They played up gamely, so many of the old buffers, showed that they had the

class privilege, and the  
needs of peoples, and  
of governance, or the  
bound to produce the  
been recorded, and i  
to another. The old  
condemned individual  
men" (with exception  
generally, as their pre  
as witches, or defend  
forced women and ch  
day in their factories,  
sentenced boys and gi  
batches for pilfering a  
own economic cruelty  
an old order evil in it:  
in its sinister betraya  
youth, during the wa  
verdict against them.

They have pleaded  
have heard gray-head  
ing can be done unti  
world must wait for th  
much to come of it."

## THE CHANCE OF YOUTH

the corruption and cynical disregard of the peoples' interests by the old politicians who still keep a firm grip on the party machines, have still further convinced men of hope in a better and cleaner phase of civilization governed by reason instead of passion and by economic unity instead of greedy rivalry, that the malady of our strife is incurable until the old men pass away and youth leaps into the saddle. I am one of those who think so, though youth is no longer mine.

I think that is the great hope of civilization, but I do not think it is a certain hope. At the present time there is no assurance that the young men who were in the war and came back again, or were young enough to escape the experience, are going to lead the world forward to a new plane of material and spiritual quality. What has youth done since the war? In what way has it carried out its challenge? As Herbert Hoover said to me sadly, in New York, when I expressed my hope, "Youth has been busy re-electing the old men." And that is true, in all countries that I know. The old men are still in command, supported by the young men. The very men most cursed and damned by youth have received their allegiance. The House of Commons in England is still, at the time I write, filled with "the hard-faced men who did extremely well out of the war." By-elections have not brought a younger, fresher type to the fore. General Townshend, "the hero of Kut," hated by all the men who slogged back through the sun-baked desert, fainting and dying as prisoners of the Turk, while he received all courtesies and comforts on the isle of Prinkipo, was one of those sent as a new member to the House, where in his speeches on Ireland he revealed the Prussianism of the brass-hat brain. The Antiwaste candidates brought in by triumphant majorities as a protest against the insane and callous betrayal of national security by the Coali-

... people more  
a maker of tro  
pages of *Punch*,  
smiling face, u  
to arouse the fur  
Lord Curzon, wi  
impregnable con  
of a people who  
self had controll  
in Germany (th  
of brain, heirs t  
policy and struc  
ghastly mess of  
doing?

As I have des  
was doing a lot c  
the fun of life, no  
worrying at all al  
all right. That v

But many of us  
active, thoughtful  
side the desire fo

## THE CHANCE OF YOUTH

who had looked forward to a new era of common sense, and of liberty, would stand for those ideals.

Looking around the world, what did one see in the way of youth's adventure? In Ireland one saw, certainly, an intense, ardent, fanatical demand for national liberty, not without a spiritual virtue, because the youth of Ireland was willing to die for its faith, and did die, on the scaffold and in the streets, with heroic courage for Ireland's sake, as they truly thought. But they adopted old, bloody, and evil methods, as old as sin. If this Irish youth had put up some form of passive resistance to a governance they hated, if they had relied only on spiritual force, or Christian sacrifice, according to their faith, they would, I am certain, have captured the allegiance of all lovers of liberty in England as in all countries, and would have gained their hearts' desire more rapidly, more certainly, and more completely. No power on earth, and least of all England, whose people are instinctively on the side of liberty, could have resisted their spirit, if revealed in that way. But Irish youth did not leap forward to a new idea or a new way. They went back to "cave-man stuff." Their methods of warfare were as far back as those of ancient Britons or of paleolithic men, though they had modern weapons for their killing. They laid traps for their enemy—our soldiers—and shot them to pieces. They were as cruel as dogs of hell, some of those Irish lads who shot men before the eyes of their women, and shot women who were friendly to our men. Their burnings of signal boxes, warehouses, docks, in England as well as Ireland, their execution in cold blood of men whom they labeled, rightly or wrongly, as "spies," were not worse, perhaps, than what has been done by other people fighting for national liberty, but were not any advance in spiritual methods or in the code of war, since the time of the anthropoid ape fighting for the liberty of his rock

government was the  
sals, an eye for an eye,  
for a barracks, a priva  
the bombing of a patri  
the new hope of the w  
war to stamp out milita

In Italy youth was a  
there the youth of the  
bands of communists,  
terrorizing respectable ci  
a call to revolution. T  
organized a counter-terro  
and those White Guards  
smashed up the furniture  
vers in a casual way, fell  
nents, and surrounded th  
in their hearts and in the  
dare to vote against the  
Only a hark-back to the  
Negri, Montague and C  
courtyards in Florence,  
noblemen and their reta  
houses, and spitted each  
stabbed each other thro-



## THE CHANCE OF YOUTH

liberated passion, the code of the Elizabethan swash-buckler, the young bravado with a quick turn of the wrist, the days when every man was a law to himself and very free in his judgment?

Less than three years had passed since France listened with a strange wonder, as in the presence of a blessed miracle, to the silence that followed the long laboring of guns. The hospitals were still filled with the wreckage of young men maimed horribly, blinded, shell-shocked. Across France was the belt of horror . . . when Aristide Briand called up the 1919 class to march, if need be, into the Ruhr, to enforce the payment of indemnities. They were lads of twenty-two. All of them had been witnesses of the misery of war, which had robbed them of fathers, elder brothers, so many comrades. But I am told by Frenchmen that many of those lads looked forward to "trouble" with the Germans hopefully. They wanted a taste of war, a little street fighting, work with machine guns and bayonets.

An American friend of mine went for a tour through the Belgian battlefields not long after the silence of the guns. Those fields had not yet been cleaned up. The unburied dead still lay there amidst the chaos of broken weapons, unexploded shells, gun wheels, the rags and tatters of uniforms, sand bags, the litter of the life and death that had passed. A young Belgian officer was his guide. Some mention was made of Holland, and instantly the Belgian officer "went up into the air" (as the American said), and in a blaze of passion declared that Belgium ought to knock hell out of Holland. He wanted more war. The ruin in which he stood had not satisfied him.

Over in the United States there was no ruin. In the university of Yale there was a crowd of youth whose knowledge of war was limited to newspaper reports and the talk of older men who had been to France and back



what do those  
him.

He glanced at me  
"Which one?"

When I cried out  
that most of the Y  
get into the war with  
that experience. I  
brothers. They, too,  
machine gunners, in  
great adventure of it  
stand," he said.

I told him that was  
thing I had heard of  
when he said, "That

So before the old time  
has been cleared away  
forward to "the great  
their pluck, the desire  
boredom of everyday  
war, in spite of the  
tragedy, the aftermath  
tales of men who call  
death "glory"

## THE CHANCE OF YOUTH

incorrigible in that way, I for one should abandon hope of any step forward by the human race.

I have not abandoned hope yet, though I confess that, so far, youth is disappointing, slow to seize its chance, reactionary in its present mood, if judged only by surface appearances. What is happening below the surface, in the subconscious minds of young men who are thinking out, not consciously or deliberately, but in a groping, secretive way, the line of action ahead of them? It is hard to find that out. I try to get a lead from Oxford, where the new men are being formed, perhaps, for the next phase of English history, unless, as may be more probable, they come from less privileged places. But the undergraduates at Oxford do not give me more encouragement than those at Yale.

"What do you talk about?" I ask some of them, and their answer is, "Just the usual things—college sports, personalities, dances, motor cars, the Australian cricketers, all that sort of tosh."

"Politics?"

Not much of that. They glance at the headlines of the *Daily Mail*. They don't bother to wade through Parliamentary reports, unless they have to mug them up for an insincere debate in which they speak to a brief. Of course there is a political crowd. There are clubs in which the political and economical problems of the world are discussed with a certain amount of intensity, but without any real conviction or any new school of thought. The old traditions prevail,—the belief that a political career depends upon party patronage, and is the same old game of "ins" and "outs." Men discuss whether it will be better to link up with the Coalition or the Independent Liberals, or even with labor, for the sake of a career, office, and rewards. There is no sign, except among a few wild birds, of soaring clear away from the old party groups to a new political philosophy. There is

men, Oxford undergraduates, and were in their own class, without the aid of laboring men to re-organize. Afterward they acknowledged the owners who had issued the young Oxford on behalf of a wiser policy of international relations, a government leading the world to ruin. Oxford remained a part of the strain of social England, and the tide of popular thought was the work and pleasure of the report given to the graduates, surprised themselves in the situation of war in which they leave the spirit of Oxford as far as they could see. far. It seems to me certain that they have a different outlook of 1913, and that, unknown to a different epoch, with its own impulses from that period.



## THE CHANCE OF YOUTH

eighteenth century. It seems to me likely that the first-year and the second-year men at Oxford now will see the last phase of that University history when caste and wealth maintained their pleasant privilege almost unchallenged. Democracy, with its rough accent, will break in.

### III

A change, visible, unmistakable, aggressive, has overtaken the youth of democracy itself. The boys of the laboring classes in England, and of what we still call, with our fine distinction of caste, "the lower middle class," have developed into a new type, and are reaching out to new ideas which, beyond any doubt at all, will either destroy England or transform it. These lads of eighteen, nineteen, or so were more intimately touched by the war than those of their same age in higher ranks of English life. They were far more closely involved in the terrific churning up of English mass psychology, and habits of life and labor. Born and bred in the back streets of London and great cities, their first memories of childhood go back to prewar days when their parents lived uneasily, hardly, on the edge of dire poverty. Life then was a humdrum routine of work on small wages with a little margin at the best for small pleasures. It seemed unchanging and unchangeable, as inevitable as the laws of nature. It was rather squalid, dreary, and uninspiring. There was not much adventure in it, except for rare and daring souls, such as Lipton, Lever, and some others, who broke away and climbed high beyond the luck of those in the ruck of ill-paid toil. Then the war came, knocking at those small doors in mean streets. The first knocks were a summons to the older brothers or the younger fathers—"Your King and country need you!" Well, that was rather wonderful! They had never been needed before so urgently and importantly

that came knocking.  
brother had fallen  
"wounded, reported  
single knocks became  
women as well as at  
lad, then another—in  
gone forever. The li  
London and great citie  
provided the great n  
daily lists of deaths,  
growing big, saw their  
deaths, and wondered  
of it all. But other  
little homes. Things  
ful. Boys too young  
enough to work in n  
wages. Girls' hands w  
Wages kept rising. N  
these little households  
in week by week.

Separation allowance  
sions for badly wound  
women. With two or t  
boy or two, an older b

## THE CHANCE OF YOUTH

week, a gramophone in the parlor. After all, for lucky households where death did not come knocking at the door the war was not so bad. It was not at all bad for boys of fifteen and sixteen and seventeen, who jingled money in their pockets like young lords, stood treat to the girls whenever they liked, felt gloriously independent. They remembered the early days before the war, when there had been stinting and scraping, how miserable and squalid they were! Well, they would never go back to that. Labor had come into its own.

So it seemed, until the war ended and long after the war ended, until gradually unemployment grew apace, and the men who came back could not get jobs, or would not work, or struck for wages which presently could not be granted because victory had cost a lot of money and trade disappeared.

The lads of nineteen, twenty, twenty-one have been through the gamut of that experience, have seen the pendulum swing visibly this way and that, and have listened to exciting conversations in small parlors and back kitchens, where these rapid changes now happened to the lives of working families. They have heard the tales of returned soldiers, their fathers and brothers who escaped, and listened to their curses against war, and their blasphemous comments on peace without reward. The shrill talk of working mothers, inveighing against injustice, has been in their ears. And they have done a deal of thinking and talking at street corners.

Some of them have been reading a bit, and learning to debate in local clubs, and getting hold of books and facts to help them in debate. The youth of democracy is not indifferent to the affairs of life. Not indifferent, but ignorant of any larger truth than they find in venomous little pamphlets or lying little paragraphs of revolutionary rags inciting them to a holy war against the

toil there could be  
of them. Not yet h  
after a war which de  
mortgaged the indu  
escape from ruin is  
and increased effici  
inspired by a one-ey  
and false science, se  
of class conflict, view  
toward a common p  
labor. The idea th  
does not enter into t

After all, those bo  
of life shrewdly, as fa  
own experience, and c  
vision, without any ki  
cheats and corruption  
man whom they serve  
They see the ruthless  
who became war pro  
the people with un  
those profiteers in th  
tricks and dodges. wa

## THE CHANCE OF YOUTH

selfish in their own aims. The capitalists and the government do not act in a way to disarm their hostility. With but a thin camouflage of justice, capital and its political defenders play their own game, protect their own interests, and "dig in" for a trench warfare against the claims of democracy for a greater share of reward, a greater knowledge of secret diplomacy, a closer co-operation in the management of the business in which they happen to be working. During the war labor was petted and pampered, promised an immense harvest of the fruits of victory, a land fit for heroes to live in, and security of life and limb. Those promises were flung away with cynical contempt when the war ended. The governments of Europe arranged a peace which was to be a preparation for new wars. They ignored the economics of life for political adventures paid for out of the poverty of exhausted peoples. Reckless of the financial ruin of their countries after the exhaustion of war, they increased the burdens of taxation by a wild levity of extravagance, as though stricken mad by victory, until, brought abruptly to a check by panic, they tried to save themselves by a sudden onslaught upon workingmen's wages. There was no attempt, in England, anyhow, to arrange a gradual reduction of wages according to a gradual descent in costs of living, no kind of attempt to organize a new fellowship between capital and labor, by means of which the interests of both would be served, greater efficiency might be secured, and the prosperity of the nation saved from the menace of complete destruction. Just as labor declared war on capital, so capital declared war on labor (after licking its boots in time of need), and neither side had any vision beyond the narrow conflict. Youth failed to come forward with a new call to its battalions. Youth played into the hands of corrupt old politicians, or else did not bother. At the time of writing this book, youth is still lagging behind,



will not be bound b  
their guidance by  
They are not to be  
parties of high-soun  
an act of faith in  
philosophy, or be  
ancient precedent.  
will, like its predec  
ideas and individual  
instinctively, by her  
character, temper, p  
flicting groups. The  
those who see differin  
view is the full and p  
and the passivists, th  
egotists and the altr  
have its Guelphs an  
Bianchi, as throughou  
that is good, for it w  
of youth, its gay sen  
be marshaled into on  
single idea imposed  
monster, or by some



## THE CHANCE OF YOUTH

is about the sun shining in the heavens, in spite of Relativity, and about the need of food to human life, though doctors may differ about the number of calories required for human sustenance.

The new jumping-off ground might well be a line cutting across history on November 11, 1918, and dividing the Old World from the New, as Before the War and After the War. Youth might at least say: "What happened Before the War was all wrong. It is for us to see that its immense stupidity of wrongness shall not happen again." From that starting point they could go ahead, casting away all the old baggage of racial and historical hatreds, diplomatic intrigues and sacrifices, military traditions and superstitions. If youth cannot yet formulate a positive faith, they can at least assert a negative faith annihilating the folly of the past.

"I do not believe in war as a reasonable way of argument.

"I do not believe that preparation for war is a preventive of war.

"I do not believe that armed conflict is necessary to the spiritual vigor of mankind.

"I do not believe that the victory of one nation over another increases the wealth of the victor nation.

"I do not believe that national egotism is the supreme virtue of the individual and the state.

"I do not believe that there must be an eternal conflict between those who do the rough work of the world and those who organize the produce of their labor.

"I do not believe that civilization reached its highest phase in 1914.

"I do not believe that cruelty is an essential element of human nature, that selfishness is the highest and strongest motive of individuals and nations, and that the pursuit of spiritual truth and beauty are mere illusions of disordered minds.

and extermination

It is not too mu  
tions, after a littl  
Indeed, my own  
is satisfied with t  
all that useless lurr  
some of these youn  
is a reasonable wa  
it at all, though t  
which provides an e  
way of life. I fan  
debate (except for  
negatives I have s  
positive about a ne  
cleanly from the s  
world would move  
misery. "Perhaps  
cries the pessimist.  
latest definition I  
wears two pairs of b  
step without a risk.

It is even possible  
race of youth, and  
dis...

## THE CHANCE OF YOUTH

direction. Battlefields are not the only danger spots—and perhaps I am inclined to harp too much on the peril of a new war, not saying so much about the peril of world famine, of disease, of moral and spiritual decadence. But it is certain to all thinking minds that a new war on the scale of the last (and a new war would be worse than the last) would lead to all those other plagues, and end all our hopes. The danger of it is so great and evident that at least any new goal set up by youth must first of all avoid that old pitfall. Why not? What is the difficulty? I see none, if youth will say with conviction, “I do not believe in war as a reasonable way of argument”; still less, if there may be less than none (which is possible), if youth will say with positive and triumphant assertion, “I do believe in peace!”

Given that assertion, there is a program ready for youth, not too formal or cut and dried, but nobly outlined, as a fine clear vision across a fair field unexplored by pioneers.

### v

There is one man in Europe to-day—not belonging to the battalion of youth, yet never one of the old men, though he stood among them, aghast at their stupidity, indignant with their wickedness—who has marked out the goal for the younger generation of the English-speaking world, in the field of foreign policy. That is General Smuts, who looks forward with courage, and not in a cowardly way, backward. I think his speech before the imperial conference in June of 1921, reported in scraps and mostly ignored in the gutter press, gave a clear call to youth for their work in the building of a new world—to the youth of the English-speaking peoples in the great family of the British Empire. His first words were but a repetition of one word ringing like

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

a bell in the ears of those who listened, and it rang again and again throughout his speech:

"What the world most needs to-day," he said, "is peace, a return to a peaceful temper, and to the resumption of peaceful and normal industry. To my mind that is the test of all true policy to-day. Peace is wanted by the world. Peace is wanted especially by the peoples of the British Empire. We are a peaceful empire; our very nature is such that peace is necessary for us. We have no military aims to serve, we have no militarist ideals, and it is only in a peaceful world that our ideals can be realized.

"It should therefore be the main—in fact the only—object of the British policy," said General Smuts, "to secure real peace for the empire and the world generally. The question of reparations, which was, perhaps, the most difficult and intricate with which we had to deal in Paris, has finally been eliminated, in a settlement which, I venture to hope, will prove final and workable. That is a very great advance. The other great advance that has been made—and it is an enormous advance—is the final disarmament of Germany. That the greatest military empire that ever existed in history should be reduced to a peace establishment of 100,000 men is something which I considered practically impossible. It is a great achievement, so far reaching, indeed, that it ought to become the basis of a new departure in world policy."

He pointed out that "we cannot stop with Germany, we cannot stop with the disarmament of Germany. It is impossible for us to continue to envisage the future of the world from the point of view of war. . . . Such a policy would be criminal, it would be the betrayal of the causes for which we fought during the war, and if we embarked on such a policy it would be our undoing. If we are to go forward into the future staggering under

## THE CHANCE OF YOUTH

the load of military and naval armaments, while our competitors in central Europe are free from the incubus of great armies, we shall be severely handicapped and in the end we shall have the fruits of victory lost to us by our postwar policy. Already under the operation of inexorable economic factors we find that the position is developing to the advantage of central Europe.

"Armaments depend upon policy, and therefore," said Smuts, "I press very strongly that our policy should be such as to make the race for armaments impossible. That should be the cardinal feature of our foreign policy. We should not go into the future under this awful handicap of having to support great armaments, build new fleets, raise new armies, while our economic competitors are free of that liability under the peace treaty.

"The most fatal mistake of all in my humble opinion would be a race of armaments against America. America is the nation that is closest to us in all the human ties. The Dominions look upon her as the oldest of them. She is the relation with whom we most closely agree and with whom we can most cordially work together. She left our circle a long time ago because of a great historic mistake. I am not sure that a wise policy after the great events through which we have recently passed might not repair the effects of that great historic error and once more bring America on to lines of general co-operation with the British Empire.

"To my mind it seems clear that the only path of safety for the British Empire is a path on which she can walk together with America. In saying this I do not wish to be understood as advocating an American alliance. Nothing of the kind. I do not advocate an alliance or any exclusive arrangement with America. It would be undesirable, it would be impossible and unnecessary. The British Empire is not in need of exclu-

all the free peoples  
conferences and con-  
ties. We wish to  
from the old ideas  
or imperial dominat  
of the Great War.  
of the League of N  
operation between  
the easy and natur  
would be the wise t  
"In shaping our  
in mind that the  
altered as a result o  
which we considere  
She suffers from an  
palling fact of histor  
Europe are not muc  
No, the scene has sl  
mind that is the mo  
day, and the fact to  
have special regard.  
the European stage a  
longer so; and I su

## THE CHANCE OF YOUTH

European entanglements more than is necessary, and that we be impartial, friendly, and helpful to all alike, and avoid any partisan attitude in the concerns of the Continent of Europe.

“Undoubtedly the scene has shifted away from Europe to the Far East and to the Pacific. The problems of the Pacific are to my mind the world problems of the next fifty years or more. In these problems we are, as an empire, very vitally interested. Three of the Dominions border on the Pacific; India is next door; there, too, are the United States and Japan. There also is China; the fate of the greatest human population on earth will have to be decided. There Europe, Asia, and America are meeting, and there, I believe, the next great chapter in human history will be enacted. I ask myself what will be the character of that history.

“Shall we act in continuous friendly consultation in the true spirit of a society of nations, or will there once more be a repetition of rival groups, of exclusive alliances, and finally of a terrible catastrophe more fatal than the one we have passed through? That, to my mind, is the alternative. That is the parting of the ways at which we have arrived now.”

With a plea that the British Empire should act as mediator between the East and West, General Smuts turned to the Prime Minister, Lloyd George, with the reminder of something that that man had helped to create and afterward had tried to kill, by contempt and neglect. It was the reminder that the world had at hand an instrument of comparison, consultation, and international justice which might be used to lift the world out of its morass. That instrument was the League of Nations, which even yet could be made good in fulfillment of the hopes for which it had been shaped.

There is a policy which youth might adopt, within the English-speaking world. It is a free policy, not fixed to





## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

narrow lines, not tied up to tradition, not defined as an austere dogma, but points the goal that may be reached by many ways and methods if the spirit of the army leaders is directed toward the ideal of world peace, not only with white races, but with black, and brown, and yellow races.

### VI

Youth should find this a great adventure. Its soul will not be cramped for lack of opportunity, and looking near at hand in that Europe from which, as General Smuts thinks, the balance of power is shifting, there is other work to do, not without ability and adventurous intelligence. The nations of Europe have still to re-shape their internal life, to revitalize their own energies, to start afresh in a new era of hope and social effort. We are tired, now, in Europe. Our countries are filled with people who became old in the four years of war, and stayed weary with continuing lassitude. We are unable to rouse ourselves to new efforts, to begin the world again. But in a little while we old, tired people will go to rest, and youth, with its freshness, not dejected by that aging experience, that inward weariness of soul caused by the tension of a long-drawn agony, will be ready for new beginnings. They will do well if they make a clean sweep of old watchwords and old labels. They will start well if they sweep away at once the labels of the old quack remedies of political cheap-jacks—Tory, Liberal, Communist, Socialist, Bolshevik. If they must have labels and quack remedies, let them be new and freshly mixed, for the others have grown musty and soured. I think the spirit of youth should get to work first to reconstruct national life by a new philosophy of social duty. That sounds rather hard and dogmatic, but it seems to me that no reconstruction

## THE CHANCE OF YOUTH

may be well done unless it is based upon certain laws of which we can have new knowledge.

It is certain, for instance, and very clear to all minds after three years of muddled peace, that there can be no recovery of Europe so long as nations do not recognize their economic interplay, or so long as there is this wild confusion of interests, this madness of hostility between sections of society, within the nations themselves. Experiments have been made of many old ideas which seemed to hold some virtue in them until their failure and falsity were proved to all the world.

Communism had its chance in Russia, and its destruction of capital and private property and individual liberty, and all the delicate machinery of modern life, in a desperate effort for absolute equality, has given to the world a ghastly exhibition of famine, typhus, and tyranny. It has proved itself wrong in psychology as well as in economic science. Lenin was defeated by the instincts of human nature more than by the breakdown of transport and supplies.

There have been other experiments which now belong to the long catalogue of human folly. The German experiment of a world dominance by military power came to a very ruinous result, and this, too, was defeated, not so much by counter-forces of the same kind as by certain spiritual powers working in the minds of humble men and rallying them to passionate resistance. There has been the general breakdown of a materialistic philosophy which had Europe, and the whole world, indeed, within its grips. The very objects which the human family was striving to attain have been proved false.

Happiness is, after all, the main purpose of human life, but there was no great sum of human happiness visible in the world before the war, even among those people who seemed to have gained all that others were

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

striving and failing to gain. Material comfort, the relaxations of life, the power of wealth, the pleasures of the world, seemed to promise satisfaction to their possessors and to be the unattainable good to people in the squalor and peril of poverty. All civilized society was engaged in a desperate struggle to reach or hold those material values, and it was a cutthroat conflict between possessors and dispossessed. Yet the successful man did not seem to bask in his success. He seemed balked by some psychological bunker. He had no restfulness of soul, but strove always for more wealth and more power. The pleasures of life did not seem wonderfully pleasing to those who wallowed in them. Indeed, one cynic said that life would be endurable but for its pleasures. English society before the war had secured all there was in the way of material happiness, yet to an outside observer like myself there was not much evidence that those people were really happy, or even honestly amused. They were weary with the pleasures of the London season, they were bored at Ascot and bored again at Cowes. In their country houses they quarreled with their wives more savagely than less lucky men in country cottages. They had a sense of emptiness which they tried to fill by artificial means, like gambling or playing dangerous games with other men's women or with other women's men. If, then, the possession of all that society desires in material prosperity brings no satisfaction, it seems clearly demonstrated that society is pursuing an illusion in the search for happiness. The very goal of their desire is a mirage leading them on through desperate ways to a waterless desert. There must be some other conception of human happiness. Mere materialism is not good enough. Manchester, Wigan, Pittsburgh, and Chicago, Essen and Elberfeld, even London, Paris, New York, and Berlin, do not demonstrate in their richer quarters a high standard of human happiness, though

## THE CHANCE OF YOUTH

in their poorer quarters and in other parts or their civilized jungles there is a frightful conflict for some share of it.

Here is a problem for the coming youth to solve, and surely the solution is that material and spiritual progress must be intertwined, that poverty of spirit is as bad as poverty in material things; or worse, and that the ideal of human happiness is not to be found in mere possession, but perhaps in the honor of service, in work which has a spiritual purpose as well as material reward, in security rather than in wealth, in energy rather than in idleness, in welfare of mind as well as of body, and in the pursuit of an ideal not wholly selfish.

It is perhaps possible that youth may reconstruct society on a more spiritual basis which would tend to abolish the jungle conflict between classes and individuals by the modification of human greed, and by a union of interests instead of open warfare, within the nation. In home affairs as well as in international politics, warfare has been proved a senseless form of argument, and very wasteful.

Force has failed definitely, for just as in wars between modern nations victory hurts as much as defeat, because energy given to destruction has no productive value, so in industrial warfare successful strikes or successful strike breaking means unsuccessful trade to both sides. All these sectional conflicts lessen the wealth of a people, whichever way they go, and at a time now, when, after the exhaustion of war, there is no energy at all for waste.

It is clear that if labor in England demands and gains wages at war rates, or double war rates, such victory will be without value to them in our present conditions of trade. For with exports down by 50 per cent, and cost of production higher than the means of home or foreign markets, and taxation reducing the purchasing power of

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

all consumers, these high wages will not balance with high prices, nor create prosperity by which they may be justified. They will result only in the increase of poverty and unemployment, and the wages themselves will have no more than a fictitious value, as in Germany, where the workman is now paid sixty marks a day instead of five marks as in prewar days. The German workman has therefore multiplied his wages by twelve times, but he is not so simple as to think that he has gained a stupendous victory in material progress. On the contrary, he knows that his sixty marks are worth less to him in real value than the five marks of a happier time.

On the other hand, employers of labor in Great Britain will gain no victory by smashing the trade unions and beating labor to its knees. That process will be costly, dangerous, and disastrous. They will lose more by such a conflict than by an orderly, just, and reasonable arrangement based upon the consent of free and spirited men. They lost millions of pounds more in the great coal conflict of this year, 1921, by a ruthless ultimatum cutting the wages of the miners by nearly 50 per cent than if they had made an easy sliding scale spread over a long period and adjusted to falling prices. The government, supporting their policy of ruthlessness, expended vast sums of public money in raising a Defense Force to protect the nation in case of riots (which did not happen) and to pay the pensions of two million men outside the mining districts unemployed because factories were shut down for lack of fuel. It is impossible to estimate the loss to Great Britain due to that insane method of conducting national industry, for apart from the direct costs and losses amounting to at least two million pounds a day during the whole period of the struggle, covering the third part of a working year, the indirect loss of trade which will not be recovered for many years, if



## THE CHANCE OF YOUTH

ever at all, is incalculable. One expert reckons it as two hundred and forty million pounds.

Yet that injury to the nation was caused not by inevitable forces coming into conflict, nor by any principle of justice against injustice, which must be fought out lest the soul should perish, but by sheer stupidity on both sides. The owners with their funny little bureaucratic brains, their greedy insincerities, their pose of being "strong men," whereas they are weak men of feeble vision and petulant character, flung a wage schedule at the colliers' heads with a "Take it or leave it," knowing, as they afterward admitted, that the proposed wages were below the minimum standard of life compared with the existing costs of life's necessities. On the other side, colliers failed to understand the realities of national and international arithmetic and believed that the government should continue to subsidize unprofitable mines. No man among them all, on both sides of the struggle, had any broader vision than that of hostility—cat-and-dog politics—nor saw what was clear to all outsiders, that by friendly understanding of facts and figures, a union of common interests for the good of the industry, an increased efficiency of organization and output, a rigid economy of management and cost, a combined effort for renewed prosperity by a temporary abatement of profits all round, and an intensification of energy, above all, perhaps, by the elimination of corrupt and greedy middlemen so that the price of coal at the pit-head should not be monstrously increased when it arrived at the coal cellar, the greater part of the trouble might be overcome to the benefit of everybody.

That case is typical of all industrial "unrest" in Great Britain. All sections of society are thinking in terms of conflict and not in terms of combination. They are adopting the tactics of warfare instead of the policy of conciliation. The principles of the League of Nations,

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

so enthusiastically applauded by "labor" as the hope of the world, for the sake of world peace and international justice, are utterly ignored in home affairs.

### VII

It is surely "up to youth," the intelligence of the coming generation, to abandon these absurdities of the old tradition, and to establish a new system by breaking down the old frontiers of hostility between classes as well as nations. The curse of English life, which is snobbishness—snobbishness of the masses as well as snobbishness of the classes—must go first of all, for there will be no hope so long as the workingman has a silly pride in his own exclusive caste which forbids him to associate on equal terms with a man working just as hard in a black coat instead of corduroys, and as long as the black-coated fellow resents comradeship with those who wear clothes of a different cut and spend their days without a collar. It must be recognized in the New World that manual labor is not less "genteel" than intellectual labor, provided the laborer plays the game, does his job well, and looks at life without a squint. It must also be acknowledged by the "proletariat" (one of those words to be condemned by the makers of the New Dictionary) that the brain worker, the artist, the writer of books, is also entitled to his wages, according to the value of his output, and is not necessarily a "parasite," gorging himself on the blood of the toiling masses, but, on the contrary, in many cases, a harder-working person, a more indefatigable and enthusiastic craftsman, than the bricklayer or the carpenter, and, now and then, a greater benefactor of human society.

The snobbishness of labor, its self-conceit, its unrea-

## THE CHANCE OF YOUTH

sonable hatred of the intellectuals, must be severely checked.

Here, then, is another task for youth—a great iconoclasm, a joyous destruction of all those Aunt Sallies smirking in Vanity Fair, and a smashing of all fetishes which belong to the tribal days when a nation was divided, as now, into hostile bands calling themselves Socialists, Individualists, Tories, Radicals, and other totem names, each convinced that it holds the true faith, and each ignoring the common interests of the nation for the narrow and sectional interests of its own denomination.

I have granted that youth will always be divided in ideas, for without that there would be no liberty, but I have a theory that the way of division may in future be vertical rather than horizontal. Now it is clearly horizontal. Straight lines are drawn between classes so that they are like the strata of world-old rocks. But a vertical division would divide industries rather than classes, activities rather than possessions, methods rather than objects. It is hard to explain, unless one imagines a nursery full of children playing with a box of bricks. They have the same number of bricks, and each one desires to build a high house. Some build in one way, some in another, according to fancy. But they are all building up from the base and not overlaying one another's bricks. Their differences are expressed not horizontally, but vertically. So in the business of life and the structure of society it may be possible to build up from the common base of national resource, all efforts mounting higher, according to varying ideals, and not overlaying one another and crushing one another into the hard strata of castes, but working with the same impulse of attainment, though with different ideas, different methods, different results.

Germany is attempting something of that sort in the





## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

industrial organization by great combinations of raw material, labor, and mechanical energy, building up from that base to every branch of manufacture. There are at least twenty such combinations in Germany to-day, embracing practically the whole of her industrial life. Their common impulse is to restore the economic health of their country and to attain industrial supremacy in Europe. It is true that there is still the under dog and the top dog in that vertical system, and that German labor is badly paid, but within the great German trusts there is such a general desire for efficiency, and such a general spirit of service, that the wages of the men are not being considered as subject to the old ruthless laws of economics, but in relation to human factors of efficiency—the need of food, the need of leisure, the need of health, the need of mental satisfaction—and because labor is recognized as the basis of all energy and the source of all wealth, the position of labor in Germany to-day is powerful and admitted, and it is by consent and not by tyranny that its wages are arranged. In each factory, and in each bank, indeed, there is a council which represents the interests of the employees, puts forward claims for increased wages, better conditions of service, and so on, and in spite of the German spirit of discipline, and the industrial autocracy of men like Stinnes, these representatives are given a fair hearing and in most cases the claims are conceded if based on the interests of the business, the first principle of which is efficiency. Upon such lines as that, the lines of co-operation between the various branches of industrial activity, youth might organize a new system of service which would eliminate some at least of our present evils by greater equality of reward for good service (though not absolute equality which would destroy initiative) and by giving workers



## THE CHANCE OF YOUTH

greater interest in their toil because a real partnership in the progress and profits of the industry.

### VIII

Looking with unprejudiced vision at the problem of life, it is possible that the younger generation—that new spirit which I call Youth, though its leaders may not be beardless boys—will largely abandon industrialism as we now know it, and reshape civilization on simpler and more natural foundations. It is indeed likely that we are seeing the last of the industrial era as it is composed of monstrous, overcrowded cities filled with people who live on the exchange of artificial commodities and unnecessary luxuries, and sustained by the joyless labor of men and women in unhealthy factories where their toil is machine-minding and their activity of mind and body limited to the damnable iteration of some small gesture. This will sound like heresy to the big manufacturers, but I believe that humanity is already in revolt against that kind of labor. They are breaking away from its deadening influence. Limitation of output, and the claim to short, and still shorter, hours, are but symptoms of a general detestation of grinding, unimaginative, and inhuman toil.

The war with all its horrors was not without one great joy. It liberated masses of men from their machine-like life, took them back to nature, gave them liberty of movement, change of scene, infinite variety. Millions of men who had that experience, feeling their humanity, decline to go back again to the dead mechanism of their previous work, or, if they go back for sheer need of bread, use the strike as a means of temporary liberation, and go slow in their effort of production. The economic change in Europe is likely to destroy big cities as well as

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

big industries, or at least to diminish their size and importance.

Both of them depend for their life largely upon the exchange and manufacture of luxuries. But the poverty that is creeping over Europe will not permit of luxuries to anything like the old extent. It is idle to manufacture expensive porcelain, grand pianos, silk robes, all the gauds and toys of rich life, if there is no margin of wealth left to buy them, and that is happening. It has happened in Russia, in Austria, in Poland. It is beginning to happen in Germany, in France, and in England. In those first three countries I have mentioned and in others that I have lately visited, like Italy, the reality of wealth is in the hands of one class. Richer than a Russian noble with millions of rubles (worthless as waste paper) is the Russian peasant with a plot of earth from which he receives a crop of grain or on which he feeds a flock of sheep. Luckier than the aristocracy of Vienna (watching their clothes wear out and their flesh wear thin) is the Austrian peasantry, getting enough to eat out of their soil and ready to sell their surplus—not for money, not for wads of paper—in exchange for boots, plows, tobacco, smocks, or other garments for their women.

There is a growing hostility among the peasantry in many countries to the city-dwelling folk. They call them parasites, and names not so nice as that. Feeling in Austria was so bitter that, rather than sell their stuff to Vienna, some of the peasants burned their surplus stores of food! The great industrial cities in England are not threatened with such hostility, for England, alas! has destroyed its peasantry. But they are threatened with starvation. They are already besieged by the menace of economic death. Their manufactures are not being bought much in the world's markets. Their export trade is dwindling down to nothing in com-

## THE CHANCE OF YOUTH

parison with their needs of life, for these great populations of English industrial cities depend for their food upon the exchange of imports for exports. There is not enough food produced in England to last for three months on fair rations. All supplies for the other nine months have to be bought and paid for in foreign countries. They can only be paid for by excess of exports over imports. Therefore if the export trade of England does not recover mighty quick (and German reparations will not help recovery!) there will be an exodus of starving folk from Manchester, Wigan, Sheffield, Cardiff, a hundred other cities. The factories will be deserted for the fields again. Life will be simpler, more primitive in its conditions and amusements (if there is to be any kind of fun!), and it will be the task of youth—the new leadership—to reconstruct national life on a ground plan of agricultural industry, as in the springtime of our history. Perhaps the individual will be happier again, and Merrie England will be filled with song and laughter which were silent when machinery whirred above its wheels.

Civilization may not work out that way—it is impossible to forecast the near future, still less the distant vision, but, whatever happens, youth has its chance of building anew, on cleaner, straighter lines, with ideals of beauty and human happiness, and spiritual service, broader than the boundaries of a caste or class, nobler than the interest of wealth or wages.

Science must be the servant of youth, and not its master; machinery must not overpower men. In the last war human courage, physical excellence, the highest virtue of manhood, were at the mercy of big engines. At the tug of a string twenty miles away by some low-browed churl in charge of a gun, a knight *sans peur et sans reproche* was made into a mess of blood and pulp, without a chance of self-defense, without warning of his

## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

peril, as he lay asleep in a cottage or joked over his bowl of soup.

Science used its secrets, not for human happiness, but for misery and destruction. The very victory of the air, won entirely by the valor of boys playing pranks with death high above the earth, was used for the increase of human slaughter and not for joy and liberation. Even now, after the war, with its bloody agony still fresh in the imagination of peoples, scientists, betraying their souls, are at work in laboratories, in the United States and in England, inventing devilish gases to enlarge the area of their spreading poison for "the next war," which is now in preparation by dark minds. There are experiments of pilotless airplanes, controlled from wireless stations, and equipped with clockwork bombs for the dropping of the poison vapors which will choke whole cities and blast all vegetation and any kind of life where it falls.

Youth, if it has any new spiritual purpose, any valor for the rescue of humanity, will declare war upon scientists who work with such evil intent, will rescue science itself from its lunacy, and dedicate it anew to the service of human happiness.

There is much to be done by youth, no lack of worlds to conquer. A crusade of health is a desperate need of our days, for disease is creeping apace over many peoples and countries, eating into the physique of the white races and ordaining a new massacre of innocents. Tuberculosis, rickets, horrible plagues that have their origin in filth, and a general decadence of physical standards caused by ill nourishment, overcrowding, lack of exercise, stinking conditions of life, threaten vast populations. In England war-time conscription revealed an alarming degeneracy of physical quality. The third-line troops were a poor and weedy lot in many battalions, arousing the astonishment and contempt of Dominion



## THE CHANCE OF YOUTH

troops, who said, "Something's wrong with Mother England if these are her sons!" I shall never forget the appearance of the bantam divisions on the British front in 1916. They were recruited from the undersized fellows of the industrial districts, and their average height was about five feet. Some of them were smart little fellows, with the spirit of Hop-o'-My-Thumb, keen and valiant, but many more were stunted in mind as well as in body, with button heads and weedy legs, hollow chests and match-stick arms. When they came into General Haldane's corps he went down their lines, pointing his stick at those obviously unfit for fighting ranks, and put back two-thirds of them for work behind the lines. French peasants watching the Bantam Brigade marching up the roads cried out in pity: "*Cré nom de Dieu! L'Angleterre envoie ses enfants!*" They thought these little undersized men were boys from school.

England and France, above all, must look to their natural physique. The best of their men, the flower of their youth, were cut down in swaths. The unfit, the "C 3" class, the poor weeds of city life, were left alive to be the fathers of the next generation. Only by a national system of physical training, and by a return to natural conditions of life, shall we restore the old standards of our race and raise the splendor of our youth again. It is up to youth to defend its own rights to physical excellence, to raise itself to heroic heights, and, having gained that glory of manhood, to refuse in their souls to let it be destroyed again in the hard wastefulness of senseless wars.

The youth of the new world that is coming need have no fear that peace will rob it of romance and adventure. The building of that new world upon the ruins of the old; the reshaping of social relations between classes and nations; the pursuit of spiritual truth and beauty; the killing of cruel and evil powers; the conquest of dis-



## MORE THAT MUST BE TOLD

ease; the resurrection of art and poetry and lovely handicrafts; the calling back of song and laughter to human life; the joy of flight made safe from death; the prolongation of human life by new discoveries of science; and the reconciling of life and death by faith re-established in the soul of the world—will be adventure enough to last, let us say, a thousand years from now.

That is the chance of youth, standing now at the open door, wondering what there is to do and which way to take to meet the future. God! If I had youth again, I should like that good adventure, and take the chance.

THE END

